

OCT 25 '48

The QUARTERLY REVIEW

No. 578

OCTOBER 1948

Vol. 286

1. **Munich: The Disintegration of British Statesmanship.**
By A. L. Kennedy, M.C.
 2. **Anatomy of Communism.**
A posthumous paper by André Tardieu translated
by Sir John Pollock, Bt.
 3. **John Ruskin's Parents.**
By Walter S. Scott, K.C., LL.D.
 4. **A Year of Independence in India and Pakistan.**
By Sir William Barton, K.C.I.E.
 5. **Should Criminal Courts pass Sentence?**
By Claud Mullins.
 6. **Ethiopia among the United Nations.**
By Prof. Norman Bentwich, O.B.E., M.C., LL.D.
 7. **The Scout Movement: 1908-1948.**
By E. E. Reynolds.
 8. **Australia and the Aborigines.**
By Isle Bunbury.
 9. **American and Russian Air Power.**
By J. M. Spaight, C.B., C.B.E.
 10. **The American Labour Front.**
By John A. Stevenson.
- Some Recent Books.

Distributed Quarterly by

THE INTERNATIONAL NEWS COMPANY

Sole Agents for American Continent

131 VARICK STREET, NEW YORK

Single Copies, \$1.75

Yearly Subscription, \$6.50

Entered at New York Post Office as Second Class Matter
LONDON: JOHN MURRAY

TO SUBSCRIBERS
AND AGENCIES

THE QUARTERLY REVIEW
Subscribers are supplied by the
INTERNATIONAL NEWS COMPANY
131 VARICK STREET,
NEW YORK CITY,
to whom all renewals and inquiries
regarding this periodical should be
sent.

THE
QUARTERLY
REVIEW

No. 578.

PUBLISHED IN
OCTOBER 1948.

LONDON:
JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.1.

NEW YORK:
THE INTERNATIONAL NEWS COMPANY.
1948

Entered as Second Class matter at the New York, U.S.A., Post Office

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN

Where there's need - there's The Salvation Army

*** LAURA LANE came to London.**

When the great airfields near her quiet village home closed down, restlessness born of her unsettled teen-age years brought her to the city to 'see a bit of life'. Salvation Army "midnight" sisters, who each night search London's West End streets for girls like Laura, found her. Sheltered, trained and re-established, today Laura is taking her place as a useful citizen in the community.

*** Only the name is fictitious**

GENERAL ALBERT ORSBORN, C.B.E., 101, QUEEN VICTORIA ST., LONDON, E.C.4.

Printed in Great Britain by WILLIAM CLOWES & Sons, Limited, London and Beccles

THE QUARTERLY REVIEW

No. 578.—OCTOBER 1948.

Art. 1.—MUNICH: THE DISINTEGRATION OF BRITISH STATESMANSHIP.

*(The Munich Agreement was signed at 2.30 a.m. on
Sept. 30, 1938)*

1. *The Gathering Storm.* By Winston Churchill. Cassell, 1948.
2. *Munich: Prologue to Tragedy.* By J. W. Wheeler-Bennett. Macmillan, 1948.
3. *The Life of Neville Chamberlain.* By Keith Feiling. Macmillan, 1946.
4. *Munich: Before and After.* By W. W. Hadley. Cassell, 1944.

WHEN Mr Churchill's 'War Memoirs' began to appear in the world's Press, many readers who turned eagerly to the first instalment had a momentary disappointment on finding that it contained no war-time secrets. It did not in fact touch the author's own premiership at all, nor even refer to the events that led up to his appointment. The great war-leader had begun his narrative with an account of the situation created in 1919 by the First World War. His readers soon realised, however, that Mr Churchill had got his perspective in good focus. Munich was not an isolated event. It was a consequence; and whoever wishes to understand the crisis of 1937-39 must trace its causes back to the mood of mingled lassitude, pacifism, and idealism induced by the efforts and exhaustion of the years 1914-19.

The First World War broke a generation; and it also broke an aristocratic tradition of statesmanship. Democracy stepped into the shoes of 'the ruling classes.' Public opinion counted more than it had ever counted before in British history. The leaders of the country

Vol. 286.—No. 578.

openly sought it and deferred to it. The Press became consequently more important than it had ever been—or ever ought to be. And let me be candid with my readers, and state here at the outset of this retrospect that I was a leader-writer on 'The Times' from 1925 to 1935 and again from 1937 to 1942; and among the leading articles which I wrote was that one in September 1938 which is now usually referred to as 'notorious' because it suggested the surrender of the so-called Sudeten district of Czechoslovakia to Germany. But I will come to that later.

Mr Churchill's summary of events from 1919 onwards is absorbingly interesting, written by the man of action who is also a master of literary style; it is authoritative; but, being a summary, it is necessarily incomplete; and, so far as can be judged from the serialised extracts from the book,* Mr Churchill brushes aside, as if it did not count, the considerable fervour which, here and elsewhere, supported the principles of the League of Nations—which was accepted by all countries of the world except the United States as an international medium or instrument of policy. He does less than justice to those who in the twenties believed in the purposes to further which the League of Nations had been created, and who worked for their translation into terms of practical politics. This is surely to be insensitive to some of the best aspirations of the time, which were no doubt excessive, but to which Mr Churchill himself used to pay occasional homage. It was my duty to represent 'The Times' at most of the Councils and Assemblies of the League until the year 1935; and I saw it accomplish much valuable work, political and non-political, especially during the periods when the lead was taken first by Sir Austen Chamberlain and later by Mr Eden. Without leadership nothing was ever achieved. The smaller nations usually looked to Britain or France to provide it and were ready to follow it whenever the leaders really seemed to mean business.

Lord Cecil, part founder and chief prophet of the League, used to say that it represented a new spirit and a new ambition among the nations—competition in well-doing instead of competition for power. And during the early years it did much to justify this hope. It is necessary

* The Memoirs had not appeared in book form at the time of writing.

to dwell on these points, for most people have by now forgotten the enormously valuable help which the League afforded to the war-wrecked countries. Its economic and financial reconstruction of Austria and Hungary and Bulgaria succeeded after ordinary diplomatic methods had failed. Under the dynamic leadership of Nansen it settled homeless refugees much more successfully than has so far happened to the unfortunate D.P.s of to-day. It organised the fight against epidemics, not only in Europe, but in China, where at one time it had three separate commissions at work. It controlled the legitimate traffic in opium and was on the way to suppress the illegal trade. And as conditions generally became more normal, one country after another applied to it for expert advisers; the governments of these more or less backward countries found it more compatible with their *amour-propre* to appeal to the League than to an individual State; and this especially was true of China, where at one time or another British, German, Italian, French, Polish, Danish, and Yugoslav technical experts helped to reorganise anti-flood measures, telephones, communications, roads, the post office, hydraulic services, and education. There is no doubt that the Secretariat of the League had become an international Ministry of Health; it may be hoped that the Secretariat of U.N.O. will some day achieve a position of equal authority and usefulness. The League deserved the support of British Governments and of public opinion for its economic, non-political international achievements.

Its political value was much less. Nevertheless, in the nineteen years of its effective existence (1920-39) its Council settled over thirty international differences, including some which had roused strong feelings; and in addition to these arbitral achievements, the Council directed a system of supervision over the minorities in several countries, whose frontiers it had not been possible to draw in exact conformity with racial distribution. In Poland, Greece, Hungary, Rumania, and other countries remnants of alien races remained. The League by firm and tactful handling bettered the lot of many of them without unduly ruffling the susceptibilities of the sovereign State. But, in connection with later events, it is important to remember that German minorities had been afforded no such protection. The Germans in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Denmark,

and Rumania had nowhere to look except to Germany. In this respect the League's activities were not universal but partial; and this partiality was exploited by Hitler and became a main cause of disaster.

In another respect the League was never to get away from an attitude of extreme one-sidedness—in the proposed reduction of armaments. That was to have been one of its main undertakings, enshrined in the terms of the Covenant itself, that national armaments should be reduced to the lowest point 'consistent with national safety and the enforcement by common action of international obligations.' A separate Disarmament Commission was set up, which held almost as many meetings as the Council itself. Germany was brought into it; and, before the days of Hitler, appeared to take a genuinely useful part in its proceedings. I was present at many of the meetings, and my impression is that there was a moment when agreement might have been reached and action might have followed. That was when the proposal came up for prohibiting the manufacture and use of bombing aircraft. The horror of bombing hung heavily over all delegates. A strong lead by Britain might have carried the meeting to a swift decision, accompanied of course by the provision that there should be international supervision. Instead of leading, Britain hesitated, and brought forward the plea that police bombing must be allowed in such places as across the northern frontier of India and on the borders of Iraq, where it had proved an effective and inexpensive method of restoring order and obtaining the payment of taxes. Once an exception was made, other countries began to find reasons why they too would need bombers. Public opinion in Britain was perturbed by the attitude of the Government. After further hesitations, consultations, and delay Britain agreed unconditionally to the abolition of bombing. But it was too late. The opportunity had past.

There was of course another, and a more fundamental reason, why the Disarmament Conference failed, and that was the gradual recovery of Germany, and the obvious and perfectly natural reluctance of France and the other neighbours of the Reich to reduce their means of defence. In view of subsequent events it is certainly impossible to blame them for their attitude of profound distrust. But

it cannot be forgotten that even Hitler, at the beginning of his rule, agreed to allow an international commission of investigation to visit Germany; and the blank refusal of his offer by France gave him a convenient and avoidable excuse for building up his own armaments in his own way. The Treaty of Versailles had undoubtedly indicated that the limitation of armaments should aim at a proportionate equality applicable to all countries, whether allies or ex-enemies; and Hitler was made a present of the argument that the other members of the League (Germany being by that time a member) had no intention of ever allowing Germany to be armed upon an equal scale.

The great Lord Salisbury once uttered the startling paradox that it was better to have a wrong policy than to have no policy at all. A study of the inter-war period, and especially of the years 1931-39, offers a striking proof of the truth of his dictum. Mr Chamberlain inherited all the muddles of a long no-policy period. Was Britain's policy a League policy or was it not? It was proclaimed by successive British governments to be so. Was it a policy of bringing Germany into the comity of nations again or was it one of keeping Germany permanently powerless? It wavered and dithered between the two. As a reviewer in 'The Times Literary Supplement' has written after his study of the official documents of 1931: 'One looks in vain for anything that can be dignified with the name of British foreign policy.' A function of the League was to have been the resistance of aggression by joint action. Yet as Germany became more active, so Britain withdrew from her obligations. By the time the crisis of 1938 arrived she, and several other countries, had made it clear that they did not hold themselves bound any longer by Article XVI, which enjoined economic and military measures against a Covenant-breaking State.

The half-hearted introduction of the Covenant's principles into the practice of diplomacy created another grave evil; it undermined the authority of the traditional diplomatists. The Government's profession of its devotion to 'open diplomacy' had the effect of creating a sentiment hostile to the traditional diplomats. Mr Lloyd George had done his best to discredit them during the first war and the peace negotiations that followed it; and the impression was spread that they were men who delighted

in intrigue and secrecy and that their machinations would always lead to war. It was now supposed that diplomatic work could be better undertaken at Geneva; and successive British Foreign Secretaries made a point of making the journey there three or four times a year. The tendency was created to hold over a diplomatic dispute from one periodic meeting to the next; and often, when the professional diplomatists might have settled the matter quietly, it was considered better form to 'leave it to Geneva.' The strain of attending crowded and hectic assemblies at the League headquarters as well as conducting the vastly increased routine work of the Foreign Office soon became too much for the Foreign Secretary, and Mr Baldwin consequently introduced the 'novel expedient,' as Mr Churchill calls it, of appointing a special Minister for the League of Nations, who had equal status with the Foreign Secretary, a room in the Foreign Office, and full access to the despatches and the departmental Staff. 'The Foreign Secretary,' writes Mr Churchill, 'whoever he is, must be supreme in his Department, and everyone in that great Office ought to look to him, and to him alone.' That wholesome single direction which Sir Austen Chamberlain had managed to re-introduce after Mr Lloyd George's inroads upon Lord Curzon's responsibilities was lost after Sir Austen's relinquishment of the Foreign Office. The dichotomy begun by the mere existence of the League was extended into a wholesale dispersal of authority and direction. Mr Snowden at one time had a policy on reparations of which the Foreign Office strongly disapproved; Mr Montague Norman had ideas about restoring Germany which were equally repugnant to it, but which he was allowed to act upon; and Dr Schacht frequently visited the City of London and became more important than the German ambassador to this country. Mr MacDonald, when he became Prime Minister for the first time, had tried to remedy the confusion by combining the Foreign Office with the Premiership. He found it beyond his strength; and on his later assumption of office had the unhappy notion of appointing to the Foreign Office a legal luminary, Sir John Simon (now Lord Simon), who knew nothing at all about foreign affairs, with the intention that he himself would still retain the direction of our policy abroad. At one time, in addition to having

Mr Eden as equal-in-authority Minister for the League side by side with Sir John Simon, Sir Robert Vansittart, as he then was, was retained as Diplomatic adviser after Sir Alexander Cadogan had succeeded him as Permanent Under-Secretary of State for foreign affairs; and it was the special function of the Adviser, who is well-known as a most brilliant conversationalist on foreign and all other affairs, to entertain and guide the Prime Minister.

The utter confusion of these appointments was rendered worse by the elevation of the Permanent Under-Secretary at the Treasury to the title of Head of the Civil Service. While the duties of this post were never defined, the post formidably increased the hold of the Treasury not only upon the finances of the other great State departments—which was his legitimate function—but gave him the assumed right, of which he fully availed himself, to control or at least to influence high personal appointments in those departments, including the Foreign Office; and therefore its officials insensibly began to look elsewhere than to their own Chief for the prospect of promotion—exactly contradicting the principle just quoted from Mr Churchill's book, and further undermining the authority of the Foreign Secretary.

No wonder then that, with the Foreign Office itself lacking authority and divided in direction, public opinion was in disarray. It was not for lack of advisers but rather on account of a plethora of them; for never before had so much been written about foreign affairs by so many conference hunters and unprofessional peripatetic publicists. The principle of authority being generally abandoned, real experts were regarded with suspicion; and it became very much the fashion to seek the opinions of the 'pub' and consult taxi-drivers before prescribing a remedy for the ills of the day. The 'Man in the Street' was the source of true wisdom. Youth was preferred to maturity—inexperience to experience, ignorance to knowledge, an 'open mind' to convictions. Any new notion was better than any old one. Ideas work in a nation like bacteria in the soil; they are ceaselessly at work, and make the soil good or bad, productive or unproductive. Good or bad ideas produce a wholesome or unwholesome political outlook. After 1918 anti-militarists were allowed to gain the upper hand. Writers who had not fought in the war were

the most prominent. Mr Bernard Shaw's plays, cynical, derisive, disruptive, and brilliantly amusing, which had previously had much more success in Germany than in England, became very much the fashion here. Other authors caught the ear of the public by their sentimentality or their refusal to be serious about anything except pacifism. Mr Lytton Strachey set about debunking the great men of the Victorian era. Good-hearted 'Dick' Sheppard was the preacher of the day ('Give him a pipe-fill of 'bacey'); Sir Philip Gibbs perambulated Germany and found plenty of peaceful beer-drinking peasants who were most ready to have a good understanding with England; the man in the field was a rival oracle to the man in the street. Amiable Beverley Nichols wrote a book about gardening because he had never gardened before, and one about India, not because he knew India, but because he had previously known nothing about that vast sub-continent. He also made an excursion into foreign affairs, at Geneva, where he claimed the right to see Mr Arthur Henderson, then Foreign Secretary. Mr Henderson was looking 'desperately tired,' but he was nevertheless induced to provide Mr Nichols with material for three more pages of 'Cry Havoc.' Parliamentary democracy surely makes sufficient demands upon its Ministers; popular democracy must not be allowed to become a cruelly hard taskmaster. It is already wearing its servants out. They share the fate of the lionised author in one of Henry James's stories—'He's beset, badgered, bothered, he's pulled to pieces.' *

Sir John Simon, when he took over the Foreign Office soon after Mr Henderson had left it, made no pretence of having any previous knowledge of foreign subjects. He frankly announced that his business was to find out what the public desired and then to carry out its wishes. Since

* On one occasion Sir Ronald Lindsay, when Head of the Foreign Office, had to present a report to the Cabinet. He told me afterwards that its members appeared so stale and tired that they did not seem to take in what he said. Similarly when Mr Gregory, a senior official of the Foreign Office, went to ask Mr Ramsay MacDonald, who was electioneering, whether the Zinovieff letter should be published, he found the Prime Minister in such a whirl that, as he told me afterwards, he hardly seemed to grasp the significance of the letter. Nevertheless he authorised its publication.

Mr Arthur Henderson suffered a complete breakdown of health after his term of office was over, as Sir Austen Chamberlain had done while he was still in charge of the Foreign Office.

the blind cannot lead the blind it is not surprising that diplomacy by public opinion led Britain into the ditch.

How far the disintegration of policy derived from a general decline in moral standards is perhaps for the moralist to decide. The refusal to accept Divine authority must clearly result in the diminution of respect for any kind of authority; and without authority political leadership becomes almost impossible. The increase of the critical spirit and of cynicism, concentration upon material gain, greatly increased opportunities of pleasure and the search for a care-free existence undermined the sense of responsibility and acceptance of the law of consequences. Men's minds were drawn away from first principles. Moral values were distorted. Minor graces, such as 'the human touch,' and 'seeing the other fellow's point of view,' were exaggerated into major virtues. The vision of the dividing line between good and evil was blurred. Violations of treaties, even political murders, were explained away and easily excused. Silly words like 'eliminated' were accepted to mean put to death without trial. 'Daring' came to mean not a feat of bravery but willingness to defy convention. The distortion of language corresponded to a change in the national character. Ribbentrop reported to Hitler that we had become soft. The softness had fortunately not permeated our national life to the depth that the superficial Ribbentrop imagined and Hitler eagerly believed; but all the same Chamberlain had not nearly the same robust and healthy spirit behind him in the Munich period as Grey had had in 1914.*

When the sense of discipline has become temporarily relaxed the natural kindliness of the English race is apt to assume excessive proportions and shows itself in the form of indiscriminate humanitarianism. When therefore in 1935 Mussolini invaded Abyssinia public sentiment completely outran discretion. Regarding the objectives of the League (even without the U.S.A.) as limitless, it made no distinction between the successful non-political work of the League and its already obvious unfitness for diplomatic negotiation. It pressed unthinkingly for

* It may be noted that these weaknesses were foreseen and foretold, as a consequence of the decline of Christian faith, by Pope Pius XI in his Encyclical of Dec. 28, 1922.

'League action' in a matter which had better have been coolly directed from the Foreign Office.

Two courses were clearly open to our choice when the Italian army committed its act of unprovoked aggression against the Ethiopian Empire—which had been foreseeable for several months. We could have adopted a wholehearted policy of drastic 'sanctions' and made Italian success impossible—at the risk of becoming involved in war ourselves; or else we could have chosen the way of the old diplomacy, which would have had regard to the several treaties between Abyssinia, Italy, France, and Britain which governed just such an emergency as had arisen. The last of these Agreements had been authorised on behalf of Britain by Sir Austen Chamberlain some years after the League of Nations had been in existence; it was based upon the Anglo-French-Italian Treaty of 1906. That convention had been drawn upon the lines of the 'Spheres of Influence' Agreements which in times past had so often averted conflicts between the Great Powers—and which had been resorted to by men so eminently honourable as Lord Salisbury and Sir Edward Grey. The Treaty of 1906, supplemented by the 'Exchange of Notes' between Britain and Italy in 1925, ordained that if there occurred a disturbance of the *status quo* in Abyssinia the three Powers should regard their interests as 'paramount' in three separate and clearly defined zones of Abyssinia, without the sovereign rights of the Negus being in any way invalidated. In 1935 therefore the Foreign Office did actually propose that a settlement should be negotiated on that basis, with Abyssinia taking part in the negotiation.

The 'disturbance' having been caused by one of the Powers that was itself a signatory, the adoption of the course prescribed by the 1906 Treaty was obviously fraught with the cynicism which the public of the twenties and thirties so freely ascribed to the old diplomacy. Yet the result of adopting it would in all probability have been to bring the Italian invasion to an end as soon as Adowa had been reached and reconquered—for the desire to avenge the Italian defeat of 1896 had a large part in Mussolini's motives; the Foreign Office would have preserved correct relations with Italy; it would have maintained Haile Selassie on his throne; and the union of Mussolini and

Hitler might have been prevented, for they were still sharply antagonised over the question of Austria.

However, the British public would have none of it. An unmistakable act of aggression had been committed, and the League must take counter-action. The hostile reception a few months later of the compromise arrangement reached by Sir Samuel Hoare and M. Laval, and at first approved by Mr Baldwin, showed that British public opinion was all out for League action and that nothing else would satisfy it.

Very well—then the League policy should have been effected with the utmost vigour. If oil—and especially lubricating oil—had been denied to Mussolini, his tanks and his aeroplanes would soon have been immobilised and he could not have overcome the brave resistance of the Abyssinian mountaineers. But instead of a bold and comprehensive policy of total restriction of exports to Italy—which would have harmed our merchants and risked war—a policy of minor pin-pricking restrictions was adopted, which only infuriated the Italians, offended their national pride, and drove them to support the Abyssinian adventure with far more enthusiasm than they had shown when the attack had first been launched. The prohibition of exports to Italy was applied with carefully graduated severity; but each increasing pressure followed Italian military successes instead of anticipating them. Mussolini's anger turned to scorn; and the watching Hitler finally decided that the League was politically ineffective. When Abyssinia had been occupied by the Italian armies and its Emperor had fled, Mussolini declared Italy to be a 'satisfied Power,' and offered to renew good relations with Britain. The British Press, led by 'The Times,' continued to storm at him; his offer was ignored; and when, later in that same disastrous year 1936, the League was ineffective in the Rhineland, the Italian dictator threw in his lot with Hitler.

British statesmanship, guided by a well-meaning, indignant, and ill-informed public opinion, failed completely in its first big stroke of League diplomacy; it was to fail again when Hitler, on March 7, 1936, invaded the Rhine provinces, where no German troops were allowed to be stationed according to the Treaty of Versailles and the Treaty of Locarno.

At that time I was serving in the Berlin Office of 'The Times,' and I was of the opinion, which I have seen no reason ever to change, that that was the moment when Hitler could have been halted. It was almost certainly the last opportunity when he could have been checked without a war.

Until that moment there had been some semblance of excuse for Hitler's repeated violations of the Treaty of Versailles. They had almost all been directed to escaping the penalising disarmament clauses of the Treaty; and as the Allied countries had always averred their intention of negotiating a *general* scheme for the reduction of armaments, and have never effected it, the one-sided action of Germany could be explained and understood, especially as Hitler from the first declared that he considered himself in no wise bound by the Peace Treaty. He claimed a revision of it, as was technically possible under Article XIX of the Covenant; and if the other signatories would not consider revision, the revision would have to be unilateral.

The reason was at least logical. But no such excuse could be advanced for the direct violation of the Treaty of Locarno. There had been no 'dictation' of any kind at Locarno. In fact the German representative, Herr Stresemann, had been foremost in pressing it forward. Its obligations were equally beneficial to all its signatories; and Hitler, on taking office, had expressly stated that his Reich was bound by it. If he wanted its Rhineland clauses to be modified, therefore, he had no excuse whatever for not demanding their modification by negotiation. He deliberately abstained from raising the question diplomatically; and on that March morning, before a specially summoned and menacingly enthusiastic Reichstag, he confronted the other signatories with a *fait accompli*. German troops had entered the forbidden Rhine territory overnight.

It suited better Hitler and his immediate confederates—Ribbentrop, Goering, and Goebbels—to achieve their purpose by methods of gangsterism than by diplomacy; for it created furious indignation in other countries and enabled Hitler to declare that Germany was surrounded by a ring of enemies and could only look to herself—and to him—for salvation; and on this cry he held a general election, which produced the first clear majority—it was

over 90 per cent. of the votes—he had ever received in the Reich. The failure of the other signatories of Locarno to re-act except in protests, moreover, confirmed the forecast of his unofficial advisers, and discredited the official Foreign Minister, Freiherr von Neurath and the Generals, who had supposed that the violent overthrow of the Five Power Treaty of Locarno would produce the threat of armed action by, at least, France and Britain—and the threat would have been enough, for Germany was not then strong enough to fight.

Mr Eden had at that time only recently become Foreign Secretary, and it is fair to him to say that without a doubt he would have wished to react in more effective manner than that of protests. The French Prime Minister, M. Sarraut, on first impulse declared he would have no dealings with Germany until Hitler's troops had been withdrawn from the Rhineland. Once more, however, a flabby public opinion disastrously intervened—and Mr Eden's weakness in statesmanship has always been an over-readiness to seek public favour. 'The Times' (in spite of my urgent representations, personally telephoned by myself over the open telephone from Berlin after a conversation with the British Ambassador) gave the keynote in an article entitled 'A chance to re-build'—to rebuild on the ruins of a broken treaty! It argued that Germany was after all only retaking sovereign possession of German territory; and the public in general turned a blind eye to the breaking of a solemn treaty, voluntarily contracted, and fixed its gaze upon the two 'constructive' proposals that Hitler at the same moment cleverly introduced—an elaborate 'peace plan' for Europe and an offer to rejoin the League of Nations. The prospect of having Germany once more inside the League bemused the British people, which had no idea then of the depth of Hitler's infamy and cunning. To anybody living in Berlin—and most of all to the British Ambassador, Sir Eric Phipps—the proposal appeared completely farcical. Every day tirades were being delivered against the Geneva institution, and everything that it stood for was derided in the Press. Foreigners inside Germany knew perfectly well that Hitler's Reich was not only not international, it was violently anti-international.

The Foreign Office was of course perfectly informed on

all these points, but it was over-ridden by Mr Baldwin and public opinion. The stiffest Note which Mr Eden, prompted by Sir Robert Vansittart, addressed to Hitler was the 'Questionnaire,' a series of very searching inquiries about Germany's future intentions, her views as to when a Treaty had to be observed and when it could be set aside, and other questions which certainly were blunter than are usually contained in despatches from one government to another. But this scrap of plain-speaking was withdrawn, the mild-mannered British Press arguing that it was scarcely compatible with the dignity of an independent Great Power to answer such questions (though in point of fact I had been assured on both sides of the Wilhelmstrasse, in von Neurath's office as in Ribbentrop's, that the German answers were ready).

The grim story of those days, and of the days that followed, is admirably related by Mr Wheeler-Bennett; and anyone desirous of refreshing his memory of their detailed history cannot do better than to read first his well-documented 'Munich: Prologue to Tragedy,' and then the equally well-balanced narrative of Professor Keith Feiling, whose eminently fair biography of Mr Neville Chamberlain contrives to create a historical background for events which are still somewhere between history and contemporary politics. His book covers in the greatest detail the last two years of peace. During that time, as all remember, Hitler's claims grew with each success—every seizure of territory being accompanied by the loud assertion that it was the last which Germany had to make. Austria was brutally occupied in the spring of 1938—Austria, whose independence had been proclaimed time after time by Britain, France, and Italy, both severally and as members of the League of Nations; and yet when her territory was overrun, the British Foreign Secretary, by then Lord Halifax, complacently declared that the Anschluss was 'probably inevitable.' Lord Halifax was to prove himself a stubborn champion of resistance to Hitler; but could British policy sink to lower depths than to support the independence of a small State for a whole series of years, on paper; and then at the first test of hard fact announce that its absorption by another country was inevitable! How little had the lesson taught by Lord Salisbury been learnt, that this

country should never undertake commitments which it cannot confidently feel capable of honouring. Quixotism is not a necessary nor yet a proper ingredient of foreign policy ; but in any case, as he pointed out, ' no reputation can survive a display of the Quixotism which falters at the sight of a drawn sword.' We should never have made the independence of Austria the object of our care and our pledge unless we were ready to defend it. Lord Halifax repeated British pledges of support in Europe by offering them later to Poland, Rumania, and Greece—pledges which were redeemed in blood. In those cases the criticism has been made, and it seems to me rightly made, that they were a sudden, hurried reversal of the policy of non-commitment in Europe which Britain had been following since 1933 ; that we had not the means to afford immediate assistance ; and that the pledges were given without previous consultation with Russia, though both Poland and Rumania were her immediate neighbours. We in England should have been surprised if Russia had chosen suddenly to guarantee the integrity of, say, Belgium and Holland ; yet they are not actually contiguous to us, as Rumania and Poland are to the Soviet Union ; and this unexpected access of British Quixotism roused the suspicions of a particularly suspicious regime.

In point of fact, Russia was at this time secretly making proposals for joint assistance to Czechoslovakia in the terms of the Covenant of the League, in which she herself, Russia, was prepared to play her full part, and even to take the lead. Mr Churchill gives a detailed account of how he himself was chosen by the Soviet Ambassador, M. Maisky, as the medium of approach to the British Government. On the other hand Mr Churchill gives only a passing sentence to the opposition of Poland to the passage of Russian troops across her territory ; yet without the consent of Warsaw the help of a Russian land force could not have been made available, unless Poland were herself first coerced. These important and complicated factors were entirely concealed from the British people. The futility of basing foreign policy on public opinion could scarcely be better illustrated. In matters political, indeed, democracy has a strange presumption of infallibility. Englishmen in the mass have a very good knowledge of the game of cricket. Yet they do not shout

orders to the captain in the field how to place his fieldsmen or whom to put on to bowl; and they would think very poorly of any captain who should look to the spectators for guidance. Yet in the far more specialised, complicated, and vital business of foreign policy it is common form to tell the Foreign Secretary just what he ought to do.

But space is running short and we must come more particularly to Mr Chamberlain and Czechoslovakia. In September 1938 he sent his friend, Lord Runciman, as special envoy to Prague to try to reconcile the claims of the Sudeten Germans with President Benesh's desire to maintain the administrative and political unity of his country unimpaired. While he was so engaged, 'The Times,' on September 7, published the leading article which in its final paragraph made the suggestion that the Prague Government should allow the secession of the Sudetens to Germany and so make Czechoslovakia a more homogeneous State.

Mr Wheeler-Bennett refers in this connection to the 'thoughtless irresponsibility' of 'The Times'; and as the article has often been criticised in still harsher language I take this occasion to state the considerations which were in the minds of the Editor and myself. In the first place, it was no sudden idea that sprang into our heads that evening (September 6). If anybody cares to run through the files of the newspaper during the previous summer, he will find that 'The Times' based its policy throughout on the principles which had been enunciated at Versailles and had been put into practice for other countries but not for Germany. The value of 'peaceful change' in regard to the non-Slav population of Czechoslovakia—Germans, Hungarians, and Poles—was advanced on May 30. A letter from the Dean of St Paul's, advocating the right of alien minorities to decide their own future, was supported on June 3 with special reference to Czechoslovakia. Eleven days later the principle of self-determination was again upheld; and it was repeated that the errors of the Treaty of 1919 should be rectified, while there was yet time, by consent. On July 15 the same plea was put forward, and it was added that 'no solution should be considered too drastic.' After Lord Runciman had opened his mediatorial office in Prague 'The Times' wrote (August 29): 'A permanent settlement, with all that it necessarily

entails in the way of revision and change, is the aim of his (Lord Runciman's) mediation. The conception of strategic security must be illusory if it is itself undermined by disaffection from national groups.'

Austria having been occupied six months earlier, it seemed to us that the importance of the Czech Maginot Line on the northern frontier was being exaggerated. I had myself visited Prague in March, after the German entry into Vienna, and the opinion I had formed there, after making many and varied contacts, was that Czechoslovakia lay absolutely at the mercy of Germany. She could have been attacked on land across her almost unfortified southern boundary and have been overwhelmed by German Air Squadrons flying in from air bases close at hand in the north, west, and south.

Nor had I much doubt that Hitler's aim was not merely, as he and Henlein told Lord Runciman, to gain local autonomous rights for the Sudetens, but was to annex the whole of that part of Bohemia to the Reich. The annual Nazi Rally was being held at Nuremberg. We felt sure that in his usual end-of-conference speech Hitler intended to demand the cession of Sudetenland (as also that Henlein would demand it at a German Rally planned to be held at Aussig in Bohemia). We also knew that in the last resort Mr Chamberlain was prepared to concede this demand, as Mr Wheeler-Bennett indicates on p. 96. And we believed that the Foreign Secretary would not oppose the cession. Was it not therefore much better that 'The Times' should restate its proposals, already often put forward, rather than that Hitler should make his demand with a bang of his fist on the Nuremberg table and that the British Government should then yield?

I have dwelt upon the episode of 'The Times' leading article of September 7 at a length out of proportion to its importance; but I owe it to the memory of Geoffrey Dawson, as well as to myself, to explain the circumstances in which it was written. I may add that to the best of my knowledge nobody else was consulted on the matter that evening, certainly nobody outside Printing House Square. The proposal was a restatement of a solution that had been urged on several occasions, and had not previously roused any particular public reaction.

The truth is, I submit, that, by the time Mr Neville

Chamberlain came to the chess-board, the game was lost. No move that he could make would prevent war. Hitler, since he had seized an advance position in the Rhineland and had created the Siegfried Line, had the power to checkmate peace. All that Mr Chamberlain could do was to retard the outbreak of the shooting. This he did. And he was right to try to buy off Mussolini. Mr Churchill himself did the same. One of his very first acts after taking Mr Chamberlain's place was to address an urgent personal appeal to the Italian dictator to keep out of the war.

Mr Chamberlain certainly made mistakes. He had seen the Foreign Office at great disadvantage during his years of Cabinet Office and had formed an unduly low estimate of its efficiency. He went on his expeditions to Berchtesgaden and Godesberg, without a single representative of it. He had with him only Mr Kirkpatrick, an able diplomatist who knew the Germans well; but he was then a not very senior member of the Embassy at Berlin and could not be expected to exercise influence over the Prime Minister. Mr Chamberlain's self-confidence in the field of diplomacy, in which he had had no previous experience, was indeed sublime—or ridiculous; I leave it to my readers to say which. We may in any case contrast to it Mr Churchill's practice during the war of always taking either Mr Eden or Sir Alexander Cadogan abroad with him. Mr Chamberlain preferred to rely upon old friends, equally with himself unacquainted with Europe—Lord Runciman and Sir Horace Wilson. And he showed his own misjudgment of German mentality in one of his broadcasts to the British people, when he exclaimed: 'I am myself a man of peace to the depth of my soul'—an utterance which pleased the British public, but certainly pleased Hitler more. When it was suggested to him that a summons to Mr Churchill to enter his Cabinet would strengthen his hand, he gave the lamentable reason for refusal that it would be regarded as a challenge by Hitler. Nevertheless, by his courageous, single-minded, pertinacious striving for peace he gave his country a breathing-space. The scholarly and impartial Mr Wheeler-Bennett writes: 'Mr Chamberlain's decision to fly to Berchtesgaden was one which required courage, vigour, and audacity, and he was entirely justified in taking it.'

Those who would place all the blame on Mr Neville

Chamberlain should study Mr Hadley's little book ; and having read its ample evidence of the popular and almost hysterical support which he received for his every step they must honestly decide whether they were not themselves involved in his earnest striving for peace. Some few there were indeed, who disliked the whole policy of seeking any agreement with Hitler, and they are entitled to respect alike for their spirit and their good judgment, especially if they so declared themselves in the year 1936, when we and France were relatively strong enough to stop Hitler.

Mr Churchill had made a note as far back as 1935 that ' It seems unlikely that Germany will be in a position before 1937 or 1938 to begin with any hope of success a war of the three Services which might last for years.' As in so many of his predictions, our great war-leader was right. It was without doubt a serious blunder of Mr Chamberlain's not to call him in to his counsels in 1939 ; but even Mr Churchill's skill and energy could not at that period have dismantled the mounting machinery of war which the demoniac Fuehrer was determined to use, either then or a little later. Much more blameworthy in that respect was Mr Baldwin—who said our frontier was the Rhine, and when that frontier was crossed did nothing at all. In 1936 he listened neither to Mr Churchill nor Sir Austen Chamberlain, nor yet to Lord Hailsham or Lord Londonderry—partly because at the General Election in the previous year, though he knew that we ought to re-arm, he refrained from advocating what he judged would be unpopular. In 1936 France was still game. M. Flandin, then Foreign Minister, came to London to tell the British Cabinet that France was ready to march if Britain would march too, but that if we refused to join in driving Hitler's still fledgling army away from the Rhineland he himself, M. Flandin, would then frankly work for agreement with Germany. In September two years later, when Mr Chamberlain was about to fly to Germany for his first visit to Hitler, he received a personal message from the French Prime Minister, M. Daladier, imploring him to make the best bargain with the Fuehrer that was obtainable and stating in so many words that France was not physically capable of entering into a war.* This was another vital

* Wheeler-Bennett, p. 104, and Sir Walter Womersley, Assistant P.M.G. in 1938, ' The Times,' April 27, 1948.

consideration which it was of course impossible to make public.

The work of the statesman cannot be properly assessed until History sits in judgment upon him ; in his lifetime he has often to choose between pleasing the public or doing what he believes will prove ultimately best for his country. But during the decade preceding Munich, British policy altogether lacked the three principal ingredients of statesmanship—wise foresight, firmness of decision, and leadership. It suffered, with the public opinion which inspired it, from an excessive love of peace—amounting to a fixed desire for an easy life, the recoil from effort of a sated belligerent. The quest for peace, as is now happily more generally recognised, can easily be carried too far. Like happiness, it comes as the result of responsibilities fearlessly faced, of heavy tasks carried through with knowledge and skill. 'Peace is not a direct aim,' said Field-Marshal Lord Montgomery in Paris on July 9, 'but a by-product.' It can never be assured by mere goodwill, by evasive tactics, or pliability—nor yet by organisation. Just as the right moral spirit working in a nation may in the long run bring happiness and contentment, so the right policy will probably secure peace. As a Christian must put first the worship of God, so the statesman must put first an honourable devotion to the claims of humanity and loyalty to national obligations. And the principles of right, justice, truth, and liberty need not only the security of ardent belief ; they also have to be supported by cool heads and expert hands. Then the reputation of British statesmanship will be rebuilt. That alone will restore to Europe the very valuable element of stability which was lacking in the Munich epoch. Mr Bevin has already done much, despite opposition in his own camp, to restore the authority of the Foreign Office. It is beginning to be realised that, if we are to be immune from more Munichs in the future, popular democracy and statesmanship have yet to be reconciled in the field of foreign affairs.

A. L. KENNEDY.

Art. 2.—ANATOMY OF COMMUNISM.*

*(A posthumous paper by André Tardieu translated by
Sir John Pollock, Bt.)*

[*Translator's note.* André Tardieu, who died in 1945, was the most striking among Frenchmen in public life of the era after Clemenceau and Poincaré. He was thrice Prime Minister of France, in 1929, 1930, and 1932. Of all men I have ever met he was the most absolutely intelligent. He was a very lively and affable talker, extremely youthful in spirit. He was a debater of the first order and dominated the Chamber of Deputies as no other man could in the 'tween-war period, save only Poincaré. No adversary could answer either of them back: their argument had been too thoroughly prepared and was too cogently exposed. Tardieu's weakness as a political leader was that he allowed this to be too visible. Poincaré concealed his mental superiority under a veil of impassiveness: Tardieu did not suffer fools gladly and crushed rather than persuaded.

Throughout his life Tardieu fought against the enemies that threatened France; and he appreciated the threat long before most of his fellow countrymen—or, if it comes to that, our own—saw its approach. The first was Germany. Tardieu began his career with a brilliance that never deserted him. After a short time at the French embassy at Berlin, where he penetrated the German plans for European hegemony then credited by few, he joined 'Le Temps' as writer on foreign politics, soon acquiring an influence so great that Von Bülow, the German Chancellor, once remarked with asperity: 'There are six Great Powers in Europe, and the seventh is M. André Tardieu.' The man at whom this gibe was directed was not yet thirty years old.

Tardieu became a trusted friend of both Clemenceau and Foch, two opposites in temperament, environment, and training. It was Tardieu who persuaded Clemenceau to nominate Foch, as the one man, to quote the Tiger, 'capable of preparing victory for us,' to command at the École de Guerre, whence he had formerly been driven out from the post of professor as being a Catholic and brother

* Translator's title. The cross-headings are Tardieu's own.

of a Jesuit priest: a nomination leading directly to Foch's successful command in the field and his choice as Supreme Allied Commander in 1918 that undoubtedly won the war. When war came, Tardieu, after service in the field and on the staff, was sent by Clemenceau to the U.S. as High Commissioner of France, a role of crucial importance in inter-allied strategy and supply service that he played with signal ability down to the armistice.

It was not until 1926 that Tardieu, who had sat in the Chamber as early as 1914 and again in 1920, definitely re-entered the political arena, characteristically with a resounding article in 'Le Journal,' with the result that he was promptly elected deputy for Belfort. Soon he became Poincaré's recognised heir-apparent, despite the want of personal sympathy between the two men. There now existed in Tardieu's eyes two fresh enemies of France: the first, Socialism, the application of which by the Front Populaire government in 1936 did in fact reduce France within four years to impotence in face of Germany; the second, what Tardieu, as indeed Poincaré before him, recognised as a growing distortion of the democratic principles on which French public life claimed to be based. His experience as head of the government taught Tardieu the futility and danger of governing without real executive power: a vice in the French constitution more recently denounced also by General de Gaulle. Although Tardieu during his periods of office put through a number of schemes of national importance, he found himself unable, through the system of ins and outs that marred French political life, and the virtual independence from control by the Prime Minister enjoyed by separate ministries, together with administrative over-centralisation that opened the door to wide corruption, to carry through measures that he considered necessary for the safety of the country. How right he was, 1940 was to prove.

In 1936 therefore Tardieu gave up his seat in the Chamber and retired from active public life to compose a work in five volumes, entitled 'La Révolution à Refaire,' by which he hoped to persuade the French nation to adopt political reforms indispensable for its liberty and life. The first two volumes alone had been published when in July 1939 Tardieu was incapacitated by a paralytic stroke from which he never recovered. But for this

tragic fate it cannot be doubted that he would have played a leading part in France's resistance to oppression and in the recovery of her freedom. After the war a young French lawyer, Maître Louis Guitard, to whom the task of dealing with Tardieu's papers was entrusted, discovered among them, written in Tardieu's own hand in the spring of 1937, the remarkable analysis of Communism, a translation of which follows. It shows not only Tardieu's uncommon foresight, but also that at this comparatively early date Socialism had been replaced in his eyes by Communism as the most dangerous enemy of Western civilisation. The paper was first published by the Paris review 'Hommes et Mondes' in April of this year. Whether Tardieu wrote it for later publication or as a minute on the subject for his own guidance, is a matter for conjecture.—J. P.]

COMMUNISM AND EUROPE

Communism occupies in the world a place that is of recent date but of wide extent. In Europe, its most favoured soil, some underestimate its importance, while others exaggerate its value. In England and the United States but few take it seriously. Nonetheless Communism is a reality to be feared.

AN OLD STORY

The Communist phenomenon of our epoch is merely the continuation of a phenomenon of secular growth. He who ignores its origin can never understand its development. This is why, in the first place, I speak of its origin.

Individualist and liberal civilisation, which is that of France and of Anglo-Saxon countries, has for thousands of years been constantly menaced by the effort of masses coming from Asia. The great Aeschylus in his 'Persae,' has sung one of these battles, and it was not the first. Before the wars with the Medes, there were invasions by the Hiksos* and the Hittites. After them came yet others: the Goths, the Huns, the Arabs, the Mongols, and the Turks.

* More properly written Hyksôs.—TRANS.

The march of these masses, coming from afar, was weighty in their force and their driving power. They created empires, none durable but for a time immense. Who in our forgetful twentieth century remembers that the Huns held eastern Europe from the Caucasus to the Elbe, and that the Visigoths possessed western Europe from the Loire to Gibraltar ?

Communism, which comes from the same regions, has the same origin. But, instead of attacking material things, it first assaults the spirit. There are precedents for this too. It was Asia that, under the heirs of Alexander the Great, decomposed and rotted the thought of Greece. It was Asia that taught the Roman Empire the tricks of usury and of fiscal extortion, of which the Roman Empire died. It was from far-eastern Europe that the Middle Ages' code of brutality was derived. Our Carolingians, some emperors of Germany, and some kings of Bohemia, at the most evil moments barred the path of invasion. But the monster was subtle. We are still at grips with it.

In our own day the question is no longer one of moving hordes that destroy towns and rob territories.* The horde is as much alive as ever and has not changed its spirit ; but it has changed its name. It works in time rather than in space. It does not cease to oppose to the Graeco-Latin conception of Right its own imperious covetousness. Numbers, which remain its law, it now calls 'class.' And the conquest of other days it calls 'revolution.' With that slight difference it is the same as it was in the time of Xerxes, Attila, or Ghenghis Khan.

Communism proposes, either as an ideal or as a yoke, according to the point of view, to replace the alleged debility of those old civilisations founded on respect for human beings by the State machine, where the individual does not count and which M. André Gide, that parlour communist, has just discovered in Russia with stupefied horror. Short of being totally false to itself, a vital necessity of this regime is the proletarianisation of the framework of society and the servitude of the masses.

At this point the question of doctrine comes into the picture and, for clarity's sake, a word must be said on it.

* Had he written ten years later, Tardieu might have modified this.—
TRANS.

SOCIALISTS AND COMMUNISTS

The fundamental claim of Communism is, thanks to Lenin, to have saved Marx's system from the Marxists.

Marx, the founder of both Socialism and Communism, was a rich middle-class Jew from Germany. He studied industrial phenomena at an epoch when industry was still in its swaddling clothes. His vigorous, adroit mind found in the instinct of his race and in the half-Slav traditions of his country all that was needed on which to build the materialistic philosophy that Communism has transformed from theory into practice.

Of his innumerable prophecies, many of which have been contradicted by the event, one alone achieved the triumph of realisation, namely, that in which he said that Russia, by reason of its primitive culture, its rudimentary economic conditions, and its numberless mass of illiterate peasants, was the country most capable of constructing the veritable society of Communism.

Before the moment for this construction was reached, parliamentary Socialism in all countries of western Europe had attempted to profit from the subtle game played by representative assemblies. It had indeed so completely succeeded in this that certain of its adepts grew disgusted. It was from Georges Sorel's protest against the daily mendacity of Marxist politicians that Lenin drew his conclusion: it was the only logical conclusion to be drawn and, thanks to the world war, Lenin conceived and achieved the Russian revolution, in the teeth of western Socialism.

Do I seem to review events in too remote a past? I can only answer that to see clearly one must take a long view.

THE TWO FACES OF COMMUNISM

To-day Communism, throughout a large part of Europe, is in possession of the apparatus of State. By means of dictatorship it has become master of the whole of the former Russian Empire and of a third of the former Spanish Kingdom.* If its successes in Hungary, in Germany, and in Italy have been arrested, in France it has

* The Spanish civil war did not end till 1939.—TRANS.

succeeded, by clever exploitation of electoral and trade-union methods, in acquiring a heavy mortgage on the destiny of the country.

In dealing with Communism, as all know, a distinction must be made between word and deed. In Moscow two things are affirmed to be independent of each other: the Soviet government and the Communist International. For external relations, the government employs diplomatic, the International employs revolutionary means. To anyone complaining of the latter, the Soviet diplomats reply that they are unaware of its existence.

In fact, the government and the International are two facets of the same stone, and the International with its Comintern is merely the wireless transmitting station of the Soviet regime. It is constantly said that this regime has no more than three months of life before it. But as this has been said now for nearly twenty years, sentence of death cannot be accepted without confirmation. The truth is that Russian Communism under its two aspects, internal and external, is one of the essential facts of the modern world.

On the one hand, the Soviet power meets with no further obstacles in Russia, a fact explained by the identity of Soviet Russia with the former Tsarist Russia, for long accustomed to support everything. On the other hand, the Communist International has extended its action beyond the frontiers of Russia, partly by force, partly by guile, with a sureness of touch whose result is before our eyes.

If the Anglo-Saxon peoples, thanks to their religious traditions and to their individualist vigour, have suffered but little from this action, other countries, where resistance might have been expected, have suffered seriously. One of those countries is France, and for the study of Communism France constitutes a laboratory experiment of singular interest.

THE CASE OF FRANCE

French Communism is a branch torn from the older Socialism. The rupture took place fifteen years ago at a certain congress held at Tours. It was a rupture of exceptional violence.

Anyone desirous of reading pitiless articles written against M. Blum and his friends, has only to consult the Communist press of ten years back. This brotherly hatred fixed the direction of international Communism and for long dominated French politics. The atrocious battle of insult and intrigue between the two factions of the International did yeoman service to M. Poincaré's conservative policy and mine from 1926 to 1931. I profited by it in 1929 when the Communists had decided to let loose on Paris on August 1 half a million revolutionaries from the capital's outskirts. To the great joy of the Socialists, a few preventive arrests I ordered rendered the movement abortive. The Socialists feigned indignation; in reality they were enchanted.

The same causes produced the same effects in the electoral sphere. At the parliamentary elections of 1928 the parties dedicated to the conservation of France gained some forty seats to which they had no right, because Communist candidates in their hatred of the Socialists split the vote of the Left by refusing to retire at the second ballot.

Night brings counsel. So do setbacks. The setback of 1928 reconciled the brother enemies. First at the elections of 1932 under the name of the Cartel of the Left, then under that of the Front Populaire in 1936, these hostile fractions drew together and formed an electoral bloc, to exclude the moderate parties from power. In the battle of May last * their discipline was so strictly observed that during a month expectation was rife of a tripartite government in which the Communists would join with the Socialists and the Radicals. At the last moment the Communists withdrew, refusing to serve in the government and promising bare support to the others. This support has worked more or less well, during the last few weeks less rather than more. Yet at the moment of my writing it still lasts. Many persons have been astonished at so many hesitations and contradictions. For my part, I see in this the reaction to events in Moscow; and I am thus brought back from the problem of France to the general problem.

* I.e. 1936.—TRANS.

MOSCOW'S WAVERINGS

Moscow is torn between two tendencies, because Moscow has two interests which, always distinct the one from the other, are sometimes contradictory.

The first of these interests is to make propaganda for the Revolution: Up the Soviets! This is revolutionary action. The second interest is to safeguard the Russian state, which by geography and history continues former Tsarist Russia. This is nationalist action.

It is incontestable that in 1935 and in the first half of 1936 the second of these interests outweighed the first and that the Soviet government showed greater activity in seeking alliances than the Comintern in preparing Revolution. This is the period when the pact with France was concluded and when other reconciliations, even more astonishing, took shape.

In this period we often received in Paris the gentleman whom all our Ministers called 'my friend Litvinoff.' M. Pierre Laval went to salute Lenin's mummy with a pardon for Brest-Litovsk in his pocket. Russian generals flocked to our manoeuvres, French generals attended Russian manoeuvres. This was the time when our Communists were amiable to everybody. It did not last long.

The French elections of 1936 sounded the trumpet call. Everywhere, even in Moscow, the revolutionary spirit was reawakened by the terrific success of our extreme Left parties. The urge to profit by it waxed. Under Communist influence France was put into a state of masked revolution.

There followed the trade union terror, a multiplicity of strikes, mass breaches of contract, the seizure of factories, the imprisonment of factory owners or directors. Government by public authority was replaced by the reign of cells and shop stewards. Disorder in France and the colonies became the rule. It was in effect that permanent insurrection of which Lenin had spoken.

While this was passing in France, events in Spain whipped up to a still greater heat the spirit of revolution. The hope of seeing installed in Madrid or Barcelona a new Communist State, the replica of Moscow, inflamed all sympathetic hearts, and to aid the Reds in Spain Russia lavished a zeal on which Mr Eden, with all his prudence,

could not help commenting. On the other hand M. Blum encountered unexpected and embarrassing troubles within the bosom of his majority. Thus week by week and day by day the wavering progress of matters in Moscow is reflected in the mirror of France and of Europe.

THE IMPOSSIBLE CONCILIATION

Communism has two faces. At one moment it appears like an ally in the realm of international affairs. At another, in that of home affairs, like an enemy. For France and for others the difficulty is to choose between these two appearances.

That choice was made by me nearly two years ago, when the first Franco-Russian agreement, albeit in an extremely timid form, was presented to the Chamber of Deputies. Alone out of 616 deputies I voted against the agreement. I have not changed my mind since.

At the first blush in considering this question a man might well feel embarrassed whether to say Yes or No. The Russian alliance is an old French tradition. Russia is an immense country. Without a Franco-Russian alliance, there may well be a Russo-German alliance. Such arguments formed a warrant for the various French Cabinets that negotiated, concluded, signed, and ratified the Franco-Sovietic pact of 1935.

I believe that this pact was nonetheless a fundamental error. I believe so for two reasons. And the two reasons, which I advance from the French point of view, have a more general application besides.

My first reason : it is impossible to know what is the military value of Russia. She has the men and perhaps the *matériel*. But she has not the transport. Moreover, neither France nor anyone else has ever succeeded in concluding with Russia a precise and positive military treaty.*

My second reason : even if such a treaty should exist, nothing would prove that it could be executed. For the Communist International would not lightly renounce its preparations, even amid its allies, for the Revolution that

* Anyone doubtful about Tardieu's judgment on this point should refer to General John R. Deane's testimony : 'The Strange Alliance.' John Murray, 1947.—TRANS.

is its sole reason for existence. Here we touch the very heart of the problem.

Between what Moscow represents and what western Europe represents I think no conciliation possible. Communism will make use either of alliance or of war in order to destroy what we are. But its will to destroy cannot weaken. For in Communism the will to destroy is equivalent to the will to live.

When I speak of western Europe, I mean not only France, but England, Belgium, Switzerland, and Holland too. The very basis of existence of all these countries precludes compromise with Moscow. To resist, or to disappear : that is the choice before us.

If our resistance is solid, without cracks or faltering, Communism will once more become the Asiatic phenomenon it was at the outset. But, if there should be feebleness either in France or elsewhere, then will follow the decline of all that our fathers taught us to respect and that we have very badly defended these past fifty years.

ANDRÉ TARDIEU.

Art. 3.—JOHN RUSKIN'S PARENTS.

'CHILDREN begin by loving their parents,' writes Oscar Wilde in 'A Woman of No Importance.' 'After a time they judge them. Rarely, if ever, do they forgive them.' It is a hard saying, and stated thus as a universal does not correspond with experience, but agrees well enough with what John Ruskin has chosen to write down concerning his relations with his parents, save that he strove hard to represent himself as incapable of love from his earliest years, and asserted that the chief of the dominant calamities of his childhood was that he had never been trained in affection, and so never loved his parents any more than the Sun or the Moon.

Looking backward as he wrote 'Preterita' in his old age he counts the blessings and calamities which had been his lot up to seven years old. First comes Peace, in thought, act, and word, embodying all absence of anxiety and any sense of wrong doing; next a perfect understanding of Obedience and Faith, an obedience that was as inevitable as the earthward return of an arrow, and a faith just as inevitable by reason of the fact that nothing was ever promised him that was not given; nothing was threatened that was not inflicted, and nothing ever told him that was not true.

The calamities that Ruskin complained of were, the want of encouragement to encounter danger or pain, or in any way to cultivate endurance—he was not allowed to box, because it was vulgar, nor to boat because he might be drowned, nor to ride lest he might be thrown—and the want of social discipline, that forbade the acquisition in later life of dexterity in any bodily exercise, skill in any pleasing accomplishment, or ease and tact in ordinary behaviour.

It was probably during his stay at Christ Church that he felt most these calamities; there, he tells us, he was received as a good-humoured and inoffensive little cur contemptuously yet kindly, among the dogs of race at the gentlemen-commoners' table. Assuredly a little prowess at games and the manner and manners of a public school-boy would have alleviated his position, which Dean Kitchen has described as 'all but hopeless' as a home boy and a tradesman's son.

Ruskin may have had reason for complaining of his parents' scheme of education, but there is no doubt that no one could regard his conduct throughout his childhood as anything but exemplary. A search for some of those rebellious acts and wayward naughtinesses that are the usual accompaniment of our earliest years results in but a poor bag. We can detect the young John Ruskin in the act of delaying the commitment to heart of some improving sentence, that he might watch a wasp on the window pane, or a bird in the cherry tree, or making a passionate effort to get leave to play with the lion cubs in Wombwell's menagerie, or in Aunt Jessie's house by the banks of Tay desecrating the Sabbath by joining his cousin Jessie in jumping off a favourite box. So far his parents' ideas had not issued in much harm to their only child. The task of educating the young John Ruskin was almost entirely the affair of his mother; his father meddled not at all with it except when, the tedious task of shaving completed, he invented tales of Conway Castle—a drawing of which by A. Nasmyth hung upon the wall—to amuse his youthful son, or by sufferance made him well acquainted with 'The Waverley Novels,' 'Humphrey Clinker,' 'Don Quixote' and 'Don Juan.' To listen as his father read aloud in his beautiful voice was bliss to the boy, but was not compulsory; in his pen in the chimney corner of the drawing-room he was free to roam at will through Rogers' Italy illustrated by Turner, a Forget-me-not, a continental Annual illustrated by Samuel Prout, and a Friendship's Offering. Reading without superintendence was not encouraged.

Margaret Ruskin's principles of early education were satisfactorily few and simple. The chief was implicit obedience—the sanction for breach of the rule was left to Nature, where possible. When John in the indulgence of an early taste for bronzes, as he slyly suggests, insisted on touching a hot tea-urn, he was permitted to do so. 'It was the first piece of Liberty I got, and the last which for some time I asked for.' Where it was obvious that the reaction of Nature would not be so immediate, the penalty was a summary whipping. The second principle was 'No Toys.' 'Let a bunch of keys and thereafter a cart and a ball and a box of bricks suffice' was the ukase of the covenanting mother. When Mrs Ruskin's sister—Aunt

Jessie—in pity of the toyless child unbent from an equally Puritan upbringing to present him with a gorgeous Punch and Judy, it was deemed a breach of good manners to withhold acceptance, but their confiscation and final disappearance swiftly followed. In later years Ruskin put the seal of his approval upon this withdrawal of objects likely to distract by amusing a child, being convinced that the fact of having been forced to make all he could out of very little things and to remain long contented with them gave him the habit of steady contemplation and fostered his powers of imagination.

A corollary of this principle was the taboo of sweets and fruit. Ruskin's early memories of these delicacies were confined to a gift of three raisins out of the store cupboard, and the bottom of his father's unfinished custard; nuts he was allowed to crack for others, but never for himself. The third principle was daily Bible reading, 'the one essential part in all my education' Ruskin called it. Wisely this reading did not begin until the boy was able to read with fluency, thereafter his mother and he read alternate verses, she correcting any false intonations. In this way she began with the first verse of Genesis, and went straight through, finding in loathsome passages a better lesson in faith that there was some use in its being so outspoken. Two or three chapters were read each day according to their length, then a few verses were learnt by heart or something of what was already known repeated.

In the Ruskin house there was, surprisingly, no family worship, but on Sundays little Ruskin was expected to accompany his mother to church where he found the bottom of the pew an extremely dull place to keep quiet in, notwithstanding the indulgence of being able to play with his mother's golden vinaigrette and watch the rich colours of the folds and creases that came into the pulpit cushion of crimson velvet when the clergyman thumped it. This dulness combined with the removal of his story books—*Dame Wiggins of Lee*, *Miss Edgeworth's Harry and Lucy*, and such like in early years—caused the horror of Sunday to cast its prescient gloom as far back in the week as Friday. To church also submissively went his father, betraying to his son that he found the going but little to his taste; father and son alike had a subdued

consciousness of being profane and rebellious characters compared to Mrs Ruskin.

Such intense study of Holy Scripture and rigorous church-going followed necessarily from the fact that, even before his birth, his mother had devoted him to God, a devotion which meant, according to Ruskin, that she would try to send him to college and make a clergyman of him. To this plan her husband acceded, not without lingering glances at the attractive possibilities of the sherry trade. What his father meant was set down by Ruskin as follows: 'His ideal of my future—was that I should enter at College into the best society, take all the prizes every year, and a double first to finish with; marry Lady Clara Vere de Vere; write poetry as good as Byron's, only purer; preach sermons as good as Bossuet's, only Protestant; be made, at forty, Bishop of Winchester, and at fifty, Primate of England.'

The dream came far short of fulfilment; perhaps its nearest realisation was when Ruskin clad in ample gown and velvet college cap as Slade Professor in Fine Art overwhelmed his audience with solemn awe and stilled them into a silence that forbade applause.

The most important contributions which the parents of Ruskin made to the education of their son were the journeys which he made with them through England, Scotland, and much of the Continent. In early days these journeys combined business and pleasure. In 'Preterita' there is a pleasing picture of the Ruskins ensconced in Mr Telford's travelling chariot, hung high enough to catch a glimpse of the surrounding country without interference from stone-dyke or the average hedge, the dicky occupied by the luggage and Anne—the old family servant who had nursed both Mr Ruskin and his son—of the postilion booted and bright-jacketed, and of small John Ruskin seated astride his own trunk, well forward of his father and mother and from time to time flicking his father's legs, in lieu of horses, with miniature whip. So they rambled through the country-side, at one time soliciting orders for sherry, at another wandering with seemingly reverence through the state-rooms of some great mansion, and speaking a little under their breath to the housekeeper well fee'd to permit prolonged view of some famous picture or other ancestral treasure.

By these journeys by mountain, sea, and lake, there was perfected that art gift, which Ruskin claimed to be his by birthright and to have come to him from the air of English country and Scottish hills, and there was developed that hereditary love of antiquity as natural to him as 'a little jackdaw's taste for steeples.'

When Ruskin was fourteen years of age there began that series of foreign tours in the company of his parents. which was unbroken till in his twenty-sixth year he went to Italy without them. Thither he journeyed in a specially built carriage with a body-servant and a courier, The watchful care, which had enveloped, not to say enshrouded, him in boyhood years, stretched across the Alps to advise care in the matter of trusting his precious body to ladders or to point to the risks of boating ; while Ruskin with unwearied dutifulness replies 'I am very cautious about ladders and always try their steps thoroughly, and hold well with hands.' As to boats, he will only use them on calm afternoons for exercise.

For a while it would seem almost as if, though quite capable of differing from his parents in thought or speech, he was withheld by some strange inward inhibition from translating that difference into action. Never, for instance, did he transgress against his mother's rule of Sabbath observance by sketching on Sunday until he was approaching the mature age of forty.

Writing to his father some two or three months before the death of the latter, Ruskin says :

'The two terrific mistakes which Mama and you involuntarily fell into were the exact reverse *in both* ways—you fed me effeminately and luxuriously to that extent that I actually now could not travel in rough countries without taking a cook with me ! but you thwarted me in all the earnest fire of passion and life. About Turner you indeed never knew how much you thwarted me—for I thought it my duty to be thwarted—it was the religion that led me all wrong there ; if I had had courage and knowledge enough to insist on having my own way resolutely, you would now have had me in happy health, loving you twice as much . . . and full of energy for the future—and of power of self-denial : now my power of duty has been exhausted in vain, and I am forced for life's sake to indulge myself in all sorts of selfish ways, just when a man ought to be knit for the duties of middle life, by the good success of his youthful life.'

The original cause of offence occurred twenty-one years before this outburst and appears to have been that the elder Ruskin, then absent from London on a wine-selling tour, had refused to buy a pig in a poke in the shape of a drawing of Splügen executed in Turner's newer style and deemed by his son to be the 'noblest Alpine drawing Turner had ever made till then.' There does not appear to have been any absolute refusal on the part of the father, or any pressure on the part of the son. When Mr Ruskin returned to London it was all 'too late to secure Splügen!' It had passed into the possession of a more active art patron, and John had to be content with two other Turners.

Even making all allowance for the fact that what is sauce for the ordinary man is not necessarily sauce for the genius, it is hard to understand how it was that a letter written by the elder Ruskin in 1847 failed to efface all bitterness of disappointment.

The letter runs as follows :

'You said we could not by a whole summer give you a tenth of the pleasure that to have left you a month in the Highlands in 1838 would have done, nor by buying Turner and Windus' gallery give you the pleasure that two Turners would have done in 1842, you have passed two or three years with a sick longing for Turner. I take blame to myself for not sending you to the Highlands in 1838 and not buying you a few more Turners, but the first I was not at all aware of, and the second I have been restrained from by my very constitutional prudence and fear and in case I may fall into the same mistake, I wish to hide no motive from you. I have, you know, my dearest John, two things to do—to indulge you, and to leave you and mama comfortably provided for ; but if you have any longings like 1842, I should still be glad to know them, whilst I honour you for the delicacy of before suppressing the expression of them.'

Death pays all debts, and so these mistakes, whether terrific or petty, are not mentioned in Ruskin's account of his father's sudden death.

'He was in feeble health for some years after his marriage—and led a secluded life (except so far as necessary for close attention to business). My father recovered his health however, and became the unquestioned head of the trade he

followed in London (trade in Spanish white wine)—which it was his chief pride to be. He had also great delight in anything the newspapers and public said favourably about *me*. I had a stiff battle with both at first, which my father suffered greatly from, and I cost him a great deal of pain in leaving his old Tory principles and taking up the interests of the operative classes. But his last years were very happy with me.

He retained all the brightness of spirit you knew in him, to the last—was as active at 72 as at 22—and caught “his death” of cold by jumping out of his carriage and pouncing on a customer in a bitter east wind—and standing talking to him. The consequent attack of cold weakened him mortally, though his mind retained all its power. On the last day of April (*sic*) 1864, I had been out till late in the evening. He sat up for me, writing letters. I was tired when I came in a little after 12, but he insisted on reading two business letters to me, which I (most truly) said were “among the best he had ever written.” So we went to bed. In the morning when he came down to breakfast, I noticed that he had cut himself twice in shaving and was dreamy in manner. I was alarmed and asked leave to sit beside him, he complaining of being unwell—he consented—but presently went upstairs to his bedroom—fell on the floor—and never spoke rationally again. He sank slowly. I held him in my arms for the last thirty hours, in his gradually failing consciousness. He died on the morning of the 3rd March. His wife is a “widow indeed” having lived for him only—and even I am a comfort to her only as I put her in mind of him—by likeness of voice or way of thought. But it is very sorrowful to see her suffering. My father is buried in the churchyard of Shirley, near the Addington Hills which he always loved. I put this epitaph on his tomb

Here rests
From Day's well sustained burden
John James Ruskin.
Born in Edinburgh, 10th May, 1785
He died in his home in London, 3rd March, 1864
He was an entirely honest Merchant
And his memory
Is, to all who keep it,
Dear, and helpful.
His son
whom he loved to the uttermost.
And taught to speak truth
Says this of him.'

From the time of his father's death, Ruskin spent much of his time in loving tendance of his mother though he doubtless found her very trying—provoking in the abuse of his friends, putting 'John' down with flat contradictions, exclaiming from time to time 'John you are talking great nonsense,' all of which he received with a soft reverence and gentleness. On the other hand, just to please John, she never wore a widow's cap, a sacrifice, which one instinctively feels must have pressed sore upon her. When she died in 1871 at the advanced age of ninety, her son was quick to observe that there was no human sorrow like the loss of a mother; it was to him a desolation which took from him the power of rest.

The tale of Ruskin's parents might here be fitly brought to a conclusion were it not for the recent publication of a book * which makes a determined attack upon them.

Everyone of any sensibility or chivalry must have rejoiced at its triumphant vindication of Ruskin's wife, Effie Gray, and its firm establishment of her purity and long-suffering, but many will be saddened by the resolute attempt to exact a vicarious expiation from the elder Ruskins. Naturally, but by no means laudably, when the hidden life of a great one is exposed to view with all its blemishes and frailties, men seek for some scapegoat of Azazel and drive it out into the wilderness laden with transgressions not its own. 'The real villain in this piece,' writes a reviewer of the book, 'is Ruskin's mother, aided and abetted by his father.' This view of Ruskin's parents is sustained in the book by an unpleasing descent to the *petitesse* of personalities. Old Mr Ruskin is called the pompous 'Wine Merchant whose father committed suicide in the room where Effie Gray was born'; old Mrs Ruskin is 'the Innkeeper's daughter,' while as a pair they become 'those two old birds of ill-omen at Denmark Hill.' Are these matters of pedigree really indicative of moral obliquity?

When Effie Gray first exchanged her Scottish home for the comparative luxury of Denmark Hill, in which at first she found much pleasure, it was probably very difficult for her volatile mind to realise that her well-being was

* 'The Order of Release,' by Admiral Sir William James, G.C.B. (John Murray).

solely due to the liberality of her father-in-law, or to cope with the nuances and implications of a situation that demanded the delicate tact of riper years.

Ruskin himself had some fears as to just how far his young wife—not yet quite twenty years of age and somewhat touchy as to being treated like a child—could find at once complete happiness in the more than well-ordered home of a mother-in-law impermeable to change in her near approach to the end of the allotted span of life. In a letter written to Effie shortly before their marriage, Ruskin reminds her that 'we owe them a little—all our present happiness—and our future,' and pleads with her for a little self-denial. In the background there lay, moreover, the fact that Ruskin ranked obedience to parents as one of the more important virtues, a fact of which Effie was well aware. 'He adores them,' she writes, while as yet heart-whole, 'and will sacrifice himself for them as I see, too easily. Private!' For Ruskin any obedience must be cheerful, and total, 'for to wish to disobey is already disobedience.'

Ruskin's inflexible and lifelong rule of obedience was certainly well-calculated to underline even the most trivial of resentments that might arise in the mind of a young and vivacious girl, who in her own family circle had been acknowledged to have sense and judgment beyond her years. The first discord between mother and wife arose over the administration of a blue pill to a genius labouring under a severe cough. The mother was all for it; the wife could not comprehend its necessity. Other maternal solitudes and consequent petulancies followed till, at last, the old lady gave the young lady (whom, by the way, she had known and in her own way loved almost ever since she was first short-frocked) a good 'scold.' Outspoken old Scotswoman that she was, she could not restrain a certain vehemence of speech, from which her son was to suffer until the end of her days. With such natures storms are soon overpast. Indeed there is little, if any, evidence that the elder Ruskins were, right up to the final rupture with her husband, in any way unkind to Effie. At the time of her marriage she held a warm place in their hearts. Complaints were made in one or two letters of her altered demeanour towards themselves, of her attempts to withdraw her husband from the influence of his mother, of her

extravagance, but, no less, of that of their son. The complaints do not appear to have been made to anyone but her father and mother, and behind some of them there obviously lay a fear that she might have inherited something of what they deemed to be the fecklessness of her father. That Effie might have thought that there was something of cruelty in their attitude is not surprising; and yet it was she who, forgetting ancient resentments, generously and frankly recognised that they had been all along in total ignorance of the behaviour of their son; and it was to them that in clear reliance upon their generosity she suggested that they should consider 'what a very great temporal loss, in every point of view, your son's conduct has entailed upon me for these best six years of my life.'

The first charge made against the elder Ruskins is that their son's urge to be cruel to his wife originated with the sly suggestions of his parents. What these suggestions were is not indicated and they are to the writer quite unidentifiable, though he has read the book with close attention. The burden of proof lies heavy upon those who make such allegations, particularly as, to use the words of Sir William James, 'there is no law of libel to protect the dead.' At the very least clarity and precision should characterise the formulation of charges against them.

The charge may be capable of proof, but as matters now stand it avails but little against a well-founded belief in the general honesty of purpose of the old Ruskins. The second charge that they endeavoured to drive Effie from the path of rectitude, seems to have originated with her brother, George Gray the younger, still smarting probably under the ungracious refusal of old Mr Ruskin to obtain him employment in the office of a Colonial Broker, and to have been strongly backed by a certain Miss Douglas-Boswell, of whose untrustworthiness Sir William James himself gives express warning. Millais was at one time inclined to believe in this horrible charge against Ruskin—but does not appear to have associated his parents in any way with such infamy—though later he wrote, 'I will not believe that he desired her to fall . . . neither do I think there was any evil intention in his asking me to accompany him to the Highlands.'

All through 'The Order of Release' there crops up the

suggestion that the elder Ruskins were prepared to go to any lengths to enmesh their son and his young wife in the web of a life entirely fashioned after a pattern dictated by their elders. The move of the young people from Park Street to Herne Hill is selected as the supreme example of a settled resolve to bring John more definitely within the influence of Denmark Hill. The facts in no way substantiate the inference. In 1850 Effie writes from Park Street, 'He says every morning after breakfast he is going to Denmark Hill to write and remain the whole day till six when he will return to dine with me.' The lease of the Park Street house was given up in the summer of 1851, but old Mr Ruskin was by no means so delighted as he should have been at obtaining his desire; in fact, it was not his desire but that of his son who could not live any more there 'with a dead brick wall opposite his windows,' and longed for the better light of outer London. His father, as ever, yielded, but clearly was annoyed at 'having 930*l.* paid for a house only dwelt in 18 months.' The 'old miser' then bought and furnished a house for his son at Herne Hill. It is true that this house was not much more than half a mile distant from Denmark Hill, but one would think that John's daily attendance there could not be much improved upon by this proximity. It is interesting to note that the 'old miser' gave his son a handsome allowance, and was willing to increase it at any time, bought many pictures for him and almost certainly was guarantor for a by no means contemptible overdraft at the bank; and, also, that for periods amounting in all to approximately two years between October 1849 and October 1853, the old and the young Ruskins had few opportunities of meeting.

Space forbids anything more being attempted here than the merest outline of the veritable characters of John James Ruskin and Margaret Ruskin. The epithets in inverted commas are those used in 'The Order of Release,' or by its reviewers.

John James Ruskin was well educated, with a genuine love of literature and art, well acquainted with adversity in his early days, as he was compelled by a rigid sense of family honour to postpone his marriage for nine weary years that he might pay his father's debts. He was careful with money, as self-made men are apt to be, but endowed

with a wide generosity as such men often are ; never ' parsimonious ' in the ordinary sense of the word ; an ' old schemer ' perhaps, but not in the bad sense of the word. He was a ' snob. ' Thackeray has told us that it is impossible for any Briton, perhaps, not to be a snob in some degree, but he was a very self-effacing snob—' John has brought Lords to our Table, but we are very marked in regarding them as John's Visitors and when Sir Wm and Lady James last breakfasted here John and Effie presided and neither Mrs R. nor I ever appeared.' He was a man of humble inherited piety, but never ' sanctimonious,' except perhaps in going to church at his wife's behest when he by no means wanted to go.

Margaret Ruskin was of a far different type ; she was but indifferently educated, and was to the end of her days very sensitive on the point. She was not expansively affectionate ; in fact she seems to have loved deeply only two persons, first her husband and then her son. She cannot have been altogether easy to live with, but she contrived to get on with Anne, the nurse of both her husband and son—though ever a source of great tribulation to her—till the year of her own death. She was kind to her daughter-in-law, a fact to which Effie often bore testimony, a testimony which is too sure and too frequently given to admit of doubt.

Mrs Ruskin may, indeed, have been very possessive as regards her son ; too inclined to see to it that he had the right underclothing and the right medicines, too fussy in fact, but that she was ' insanelly possessive ' is beyond belief ; a woman of more complete sanity it would be hard to find. Surely to resent Mrs Ruskin ' calling John her beloved and Heart's Treasure,' or finding the fact worthy of mention, is good evidence of a possessiveness in Effie neither more nor less blameworthy than that of her mother-in-law, a blameless possessiveness, in both cases, one would think. A more outrageous charge is levelled at old Mrs Ruskin on the suspect authority of Miss Douglas-Boswell, viz. that of being a drunkard. It is hard to conceive of any one who knows anything of the life of the old lady harbouring the suspicion for a single instant. Worst of all, a reviewer * finds it clear that Margaret Ruskin had

* 'The New English Review,' March 1948.

for her son an almost incestuous passion. Surely this choice of an adjective is indefensible, an adjective, than which there is none more poisonous in the English language. Its use is a measure of the unreasoning vindictiveness with which the elder Ruskins have been of late assailed. Margaret Ruskin did, in truth, write to her son. 'I would rather be your Mother than the mother of the greatest of Kings and heroes past or present,' and also that there were times when she felt a heart-sickening impatience to see him. What mother will upbraid her?

Keen-eyed and discerning beyond the ordinary, Mrs Ruskin must at an early date have noticed that there was something amiss in the relations between her son and his wife, but knew not what it was—indeed was never to know. Clear-sighted as she was, she could not pierce the veil of secrecy and reserve that hid the truth from her, and, doubtless, Effie was adjudged to be at the root of the evil. Had Effie been able to accept the fact that her mother-in-law always had treated and always would treat her son as a child—and Effie also—her life might have been much easier. Matriarch, despot perhaps, Margaret Ruskin was, but altogether self-sacrificing and incapable of groundless malevolence.

It seems to be of importance to have clearly in mind just what the elder Ruskins believed at the time of the declaration of nullity of marriage. They believed either that their son had assumed a burden of guilt that was not his, or, less probably, that the marriage between their son and Effie had never been consummated because of the lack of that intense love which he thought to be the only justification for intimate relations. He was repeating that story nigh twenty years afterwards. They knew nothing of their son's impotency. They were certain that Effie had been false to her marriage vows, and that Millais was her partner in guilt; only this certainty could explain the set purpose of old Mr Ruskin to slash Millais' portrait of his son, fortunately thwarted by John carrying it away to the safety of Rossetti's studio.

A review * of 'The Order of Release' tells us that 'The old Ruskins ran round the town with misrepresentations'—not bad for an early Victorian lady who had been a

* 'Times Literary Supplement,' Jan. 31, 1948.

septuagenarian for three years and rarely if ever went into society! But oddly enough the only evidence germane to this statement to be found in the book is that of David Roberts, who had suffered much from the vitriolic pen of John Ruskin in 'Academy Notes.'

There are many parts of this sad story of Effie Gray and Ruskin that still await explanation. If Ruskin's conduct was as severely reprobated as is indicated by Sir William James, how was it that Gladstone invited him to Hawarden and paid him 'deferential reverence'? How was it that Mrs Browning, Mary Mitford, Lord Mount Temple, Lord Acton, Dr John Brown, and Cardinal Manning—to name but a few—were so intimate with him? Above all, how was it that Rawdon Brown, the confidante of Effie Gray, was at the same time *Pappa* to Ruskin and he *figlio* to Brown? How was it that he was left on a pedestal to the undoing of Rose La Touche, a fairer flower than even Effie Gray, and how was it that the reconciliation with Mrs La Touche was so complete? How was it that George MacDonald, a man of marked uprightness, held Ruskin in such high esteem that he readily accepted his laughing denial of impotency and made the way easy for him to carry on his strange courtship of Rose La Touche in direct opposition to her parents' wishes? Was the failure of Ruskin's marriage due to a physiological, or, as Dr Greville MacDonald * believed, to a psychological cause? A thorough and disinterested examination of the six hundred letters in the hands of Effie Gray's descendants, the letters which Dr MacDonald was prevented from publishing, and the statement which Ruskin wrote for his proctor on the eve of the nullity trial might furnish answers to some, at least, of these queries. Not yet can it be said of Ruskin, 'Who will has heard Sordello's story told.'

WALTER S. SCOTT.

Thanks are due to the Ruskin Trustees for permission to use extracts from Ruskin Family Letters printed in this article.

* 'Reminiscences of a Specialist,' Allen and Unwin, Ltd.

Art. 4.—A YEAR OF INDEPENDENCE IN INDIA AND PAKISTAN.

THE existence of an agglomeration of political units, small and great, fighting among each other for the prize of empire, has been a characteristic of Indian polity down the ages. Great empires at times have been evolved, only to be followed by a mosaic of independent kingdoms.

India, on the fall of the Moguls, had reverted to type when, in the middle of the eighteenth century, the British appeared on the scene as rivals for political power.

The viceroys of Oudh and Bengal had renounced their allegiance to Delhi; Asafjah, founder of the present dynasty of Hyderabad, then viceroy of the Mogul province of the South, had declared his independence in 1725. The Rajput Princes of Rajputana and Central India had severed their connection with Delhi. Mysore was an independent kingdom, Travancore and Cochin had a similar status. Several new States had been set up by Hindu Maratha war-lords. The Punjab and Kashmir had been appropriated by the king of Kabul.

Anarchy and chaos lay like a blight almost everywhere. It fell to the British to establish peace and order. By the middle of the nineteenth century they had built up an empire that for the first time in history covered the whole of the sub-continent, from the Karakoram mountains in north Kashmir to Cape Comorin, from the Afghan border to Burma. Thirty years or so later Burma was absorbed in the vast new empire.

It was not long before a new genus, unknown in earlier ages, a Hindu political intelligentsia, obtruded itself. For nearly half a century its active element in the Hindu Congress has dreamt of substituting for British rule an empire comparable to the great Buddhist empire of Asoka that flourished 2,300 years ago. Hindu politicians fell in love with British democracy; acclimatised in India it would, with the Hindu majority, mean Hindu rule.

But Moslems had not forgotten that it was their forebears who ruled India before the British; they were not prepared to accept the principle of majority rule. The political ambitions of the Hindu widened the gulf between the two great communities till it became practically

unbridgeable. British efforts to balance conflicting interests proved abortive; finally in February of last year the British Government announced that they would hand over power in June of the following year.

Partition was now inevitable; the dream of unity vanished. There must be two Indias, Moslem and Hindu. The administration by this time was rapidly weakening; corruption was widespread. It was difficult to hold communal frenzy in check after the ghastly massacres in Calcutta, Bihar, and the North-West Punjab. Hindus and Moslems were at loggerheads in the interim government. Lord Mountbatten was persuaded that the only possibility of avoiding hopeless chaos was to hand over power to the rival communities, each in its own sphere, at the earliest possible moment. He flew to London and succeeded in bringing his Majesty's Government round to his point of view. August 15 was fixed as the date of inaugurating the new era. An Indian Independence Bill was rushed through Parliament.

Little time was left to make essential preparations. The Army, Navy, and Air Force were divided on a communal basis, only a third being assigned to Pakistan despite its responsibility for protecting the North-West Frontier.

Both the new governments were embarrassed at the outset by frightful outbreaks of communal frenzy in the Punjab, Delhi, and elsewhere. Hindus and Sikhs were not prepared to stay on in the West Punjab, nor Moslems in the east of that province. There were mass migrations in both directions, involving twelve or thirteen million people for whom accommodation had to be found in their new habitat. The expense has been enormous. The toll of human life as a result of the massacres, from disease, exposure, drowning in crossing flooded rivers, will probably never be computed with any approach to accuracy. It must run into millions. The problem of re-settlement is still unsolved.

Apart from communal feeling, irritation between the governments was heightened by the intervention of India in Kashmir and by the holding up of cash credits and war material due to Pakistan. Mr Gandhi intervened at this stage and advised the handing over to the Moslem Government of the cash balances to which it was entitled. There-

after relations improved and many outstanding questions between the two have been settled, for example, railway and postal communications, customs, banking arrangements, share of debt. An air pact has been concluded.

Congress under the leadership of Pandit Nehru as Prime Minister and Sardar Patel as Deputy Prime Minister, has maintained its supremacy through the trials and strains of the first year of independence, despite the loss it has suffered through the assassination of Mr Gandhi. An effort has been made to give the Cabinet a national façade by including ministers not obviously Congress, such as Dr Shyama Prasad Mukerjee, a former President of the Hindu Mahasabha, Mr Shanmukhan Chetty, and Dr Ambedkar, the Outcast leader. The Cabinet comprises mostly elder statesmen, an ageing team; the introduction of younger men would strengthen the Congress position. The Constituent Assembly functions as the legislature; there is no opposition worth the name; to oppose the projects of Pandit Nehru and Sardar Patel is regarded as little short of treason.

The outstanding problems which the Nehru-Patel Government has had to face concern Kashmir, Hyderabad—these are mainly of their own seeking—the position of the Indian States in the new regime, and the re-invigoration of the economic life of the country. The growth of faction, especially the outburst of communism, has added greatly to official anxiety at Delhi.

The Kashmir affair has undoubtedly been mishandled and has led to much criticism of cabinet policy. At a time when economy was essential a huge expenditure has been incurred on a military adventure which might have been avoided if India had sought the cooperation of Pakistan when troubled threatened. Obviously Pakistan was more interested than India. With Kashmir in hostile hands its very existence would be threatened. India blames Pakistan for its troubles on the ground that it could have kept back the invading tribesmen from Kashmir had it chosen. It is doubtful whether it could have done so with the small force available to it, and the lack of military stores and equipment caused by the withholding of its share in the munitions and military material left by the British Government. Had Pakistan attempted anything of the kind a general rising of the tribes would

have followed and the Pakistan forces might have been driven across the Indus.

The quarrel has now been referred to U.N.O. India is disappointed with the result. It had expected the condemnation of the Pakistan Government and that the Pakistan authorities would be directed to remove their troops from Kashmir. On the contrary, U.N.O. has suspended judgment and despatched a commission to study the position, to advise, and if thought desirable, to carry out a plebiscite on the issue whether Kashmir should accede to India or Pakistan. Neither protagonist agrees to the action proposed by U.N.O. but is prepared to give facilities to the commission. It has now arrived in the country.

Unless a compromise settlement is effected, there is imminent danger of civil war. Should that result the trouble might spread beyond the Afghan frontier. Here would be Russia's opportunity to intervene on the ground that the disturbances might spread to the Moslem Soviet republics of Turkistan. Many Afghan subjects, mostly Sulaiman Kheyl, have joined in the tribal invasion of Kashmir. It is an open secret that Pakistan irregular forces have been supporting the Azad or free government of Kashmir as against the pro-Congress government of Shaikh Abdullah, a protégé of Nehru. In point of fact an undeclared state of war exists between the two Dominions in Kashmir. A possible compromise might set up a small Hindu State round Jammu as its capital, for the Dogra and Sikh subjects of the Maharajah, which might accede to India, a link being maintained by the new road through the foothills from Pathankot on the India-Pakistan border. The rest of Kashmir, almost entirely Moslem, would be independent, allied to Pakistan, or it might accede to the latter.

The India Independence Act recognises the separate political existence of the great State of Hyderabad. For over two centuries it has been ruled by the Asafjahi dynasty. Earlier its present territories formed part of the Moslem kingdoms of the Deccan founded in the fourteenth century. Of the population of seventeen millions only two and a half millions are Moslems. The rest include three million outcasts, a million Lingayats who, though Hindus, are opposed to the Aryan Brahmins

of the North (a powerful element in Congress), and about a million aborigines.

The administration is mainly in Moslem hands, though Hindus predominate at the Bar and are well represented in the Services. Most of the land is in the possession of the Hindu peasantry; the majority of the village officers belong to that community. There is a strong body of semi-feudal Hindu chiefs and landowners. Business and banking and organised industry are mainly in Hindu hands. Big business in fact is more or less pro-Nizam. Moslem rule has always been tolerant. The administration is based on the British India system; taxation is lighter than in India; there is no income tax. Yet the finances of the State are flourishing; there is an accumulated surplus of some 70½ million which it is proposed to utilise on the development of hydro-electric power combined with irrigation and on a great expanse of industry. There is a flourishing university and the educational system compares favourably with that of the adjacent Hindu provinces.

Hyderabad, the capital, is one of the finest cities in India with splendid public buildings, including up-to-date hospitals, cement roads and modern conveniences. Much has been done to clear the slums and provide decent housing for the working classes. The judiciary is separate from the executive, a reform greatly desired in India but not yet achieved. There is a High Court efficiently manned. A form of popular government has been instituted recently.

The Nizam as the 'Faithful Ally' of the British Government desired to be allowed to stay in the Commonwealth with access to the sea through a corridor or otherwise—the State is landlocked. This was disallowed and he was advised to come to terms with the India Government.

His Exalted Highness was, however, disinclined to become a satellite, and probably little better than a pensioner, of the Delhi Government. He was prepared to place his foreign relations and matters of defence and communications in their hands, but on condition that his internal sovereignty was unimpaired.

This Pandit Nehru and Sardar Patel were not prepared to accept. Their attitude is that Hyderabad is an in-

tegral part of India ; to allow it, as a Moslem State, to be independent, would be a danger to the peace of the country. The Hindus of India after centuries of political serfdom have won their freedom ; they will not leave their co-religionists of Hyderabad under Moslem domination. Democracy has been set up in India ; popular and fully responsible government must be conferred on the Hyderabad people. They should then be allowed to decide their political future for themselves. To bring pressure to bear on the Nizam, Hindu authorities in the adjacent provinces imposed a form of blockade.

Negotiations followed, in which Sir Walter Monckton, constitutional adviser of the Nizam, took part. A standstill agreement to hold good till November of this year was concluded. The blockade, however, has not been lifted and has recently been intensified to a point when even urgently required medical stores are denied to the Hyderabad people. Air communication has been suspended.

Not only have economic sanctions been applied : Communists and others in Madras and elsewhere have been encouraged to raid across the Hyderabad frontiers ; villages have been burnt, customs and police posts and railway stations wrecked, railway tracks damaged. Not unnaturally there have been reprisals by Hyderabad Moslems, among them the Razakars (volunteers), a private citizen police force formed mainly to protect Moslems in isolated villages. The leader of the force is Saiyyed Qasim Razvi, whose fanaticism and wild talk have done harm to the Nizam's cause.

The Nizam and his advisers have undoubtedly been reasonable. They have now agreed to the setting up of responsible government on the basis of parity between Hindu and Moslem, a similar parity to be observed in the services. They have reiterated their readiness to place the control of matters relating to defence, communications, and foreign relations in the hands of the Delhi government. They have gone still further and agreed to refer the question of accession to a plebiscite under impartial supervision. Here it may be noted that a strong pro-Nizam party has recently been formed among the Marathas of the State. They are Hindus and number four millions. Their attitude is that Congress governments, especially the

Bombay government, are influenced by Gujaratis whom all Marathas hate even more than Moslems. The Marathas feel that the object of Congress supporters, and especially the Gujaratis, is to exploit the resources of Hyderabad to the deprivation of the local people. Although they are Hindus, this Maratha group is not prepared to support the movement.

Pandit Nehru and Sardar Patel have rejected the Nizam's proposals. Apparently they are not prepared to risk a plebiscite on the terms suggested by Hyderabad. Their ultimatum is that responsible government must be introduced immediately; the question of the plebiscite and accession would be placed in its hands. The result would be a foregone conclusion.

That is how matters stand at present. Congress supporters criticise Pandit Nehru for his weakness in not going all out with his power politics and forcing the Nizam to capitulate. Nehru tells them that he is not afraid to use his army but at the moment, with the peace of the world in danger, prudence is essential.

The Nizam may appeal to U.N.O. if the latter accepts the contention that Hyderabad, on the withdrawal of the paramountcy of the Crown and the repudiation of treaties, has resumed the international status it had before it came into treaty relations with the British.

Will the British Government intervene? So far they have maintained an irresponsive attitude. But can they adopt this pose indefinitely? A Hindu invasion of Hyderabad might lead to civil war. There would be frightful massacres of both communities; Pakistan might be involved. As in the case of Kashmir the trouble might extend to the Afghan frontier, where already tribesmen are showing sympathy with the Nizam. In point of fact Hyderabad has become an international question.

There is indeed reason for His Majesty's Government to interest themselves in the quarrel apart from any considerations of what we owe to our old time ally and his ancestors for all that they have done for the British. Did not the Nizam assign vast territories, including maritime provinces, to us in return for a pledge to maintain a force 10,000 strong for his protection? Did we not raise, against the Ruler's wishes, a strong force which we

used mainly in our own interests and for the support of which we deprived him of his richest province, Berar, nearly a century ago, and which now under international law should revert to him ?

But it is not only the interests of the Asafjahi dynasty that are involved ; the interests of the Moslems not only of Hyderabad but of South India generally should not be forgotten. Even if civil war is avoided coercion of Hyderabad would leave a canker of bitterness between Hindu and Moslem throughout India which might very well react prejudicially on the military situation. The Moslem minority in India, some forty-five millions, look to Hyderabad as the focus of Moslem tradition, the heir of the Moguls. Why not conciliate them ? These considerations might justify the British in offering advice, since they will be responsible for assisting in the defence of India.

Indian lawyers contend that the British had no constitutional right to abolish paramountcy and so to restore the *status quo* in the case of Hyderabad and other Indian Rulers. Concede that paramountcy legally vested in the successor government and its action against Hyderabad cannot be questioned.

But surely the British Parliament had the necessary jurisdiction. In any case India accepted the Indian Independence Act and all that it implied, including the disappearance of paramountcy.

That being the position one may well ask whether India has any better right to absorb Hyderabad than Nepal or Afghanistan and for that matter Burma which, till recently, was an integral part of the Indian empire.

August 15 of last year found the Princes unprepared for the passage of arms with Congress which they knew was inevitable. They were slowly organising but the two months' grace allowed by the precipitate decision to transfer power nearly a year earlier than previously arranged made effective measures impossible. Paramountcy had disappeared and with it the protection of the Crown against Congress aggression. The promised reversion of the States to their original position was a mere illusion. They knew that Congress would not suffer in their midst, once they came into power, anything resembling an *imperium in imperio*.

The heavy pressure of power politics working on the political ferment started years ago in the States by Congress supporters was immediately applied from Delhi. Many of the smaller States were absorbed into the adjacent provinces. Others were grouped for administrative purposes, leading Princes being appointed Presidents of the new government. So-called responsible governments have been set up in most States formed doubtless of Congress supporters among the local Hindu intelligentsia. There is little doubt that the measures adopted give the Congress government practical control of what was once princely India. In some cases the people may benefit, but the new system has still to be proved. Most of the Princes are now little better than pensioners and though ostensibly they agreed to what was been done Congress high-handedness has excited much discontent. Democracy, at all events of the British model, is on its trial; it has not yet taken firm hold in India. Many leading Indians, including Nehru and for that matter Gandhi himself, doubt its functioning in an atmosphere vitiated by caste. Many moderate Indians have always regarded Congress government as totalitarian in nature, with an opposition not worth the name. In some quarters one hears the view expressed that it might have been worthwhile to preserve at least the well-governed States. They might have proved a stable element should Congress disintegrate and a clash of factions result.

There are disturbing elements in the economic field in India. With its enormous population of over 300 millions the country is not self-supporting in food. Imports from abroad are essential; to ensure supply a food subsidy of 15l. million has been provided for the current year. The fiduciary note issue has increased from 150l. million to 1,000l. million since 1939, the sterling credits in London being used as a backing. Inflation has naturally followed; the prices of necessities have risen nearly three times as compared with pre-war figures. A falling off of nearly 30 per cent. in industrial production, especially in steel, cement, and textiles, is a contributory factor to the present economic weakness. Labour unrest and a series of strikes have added to the embarrassment of industry. Another disturbing element has been the apprehension in business circles that, with his intellectual predilection for socialist

doctrines, Pandit Nehru might press forward a policy of nationalisation of all types of industry. Such fears have been allayed recently by a declaration of the government that the question of nationalising existing industries will be deferred for ten years.

Legislation fixing a minimum wage and conferring other privileges on labour such as holidays with pay has been put through in the past few months. About three and a half million workers are affected. The yearly wage bill of the plantation industries, largely British owned, has been compulsorily increased by fifty million rupees.

Financially the position of the India Government is not unsatisfactory. The estimated expenditure charged to the central budget of nearly 200% million shows a deficit of only 8% million which the Finance Minister proposes to leave uncovered. The railway surplus is estimated at about 2½% million.

India and Pakistan are fortunate in having at their credit in London nearly 1,000% million on account of war expenditure incurred in India on behalf of Britain. This, of course, can only be repaid gradually. The existence of the fund will help the two Dominions to obtain the capital goods of which they stand in need for the comprehensive schemes of industrialisation planned by both governments. They look to Britain for help both in the supply of technique and management. Relations between British business men and Indians are becoming increasingly cordial.

The peaceful development of India depends to a great extent on whether the right wing of Congress continues to be responsible for the administration. Competent observers think the present regime is secure for at least five years. Others are less confident. Already the strong Socialist group led by Jai Prakash Narain has broken away and given out that it intends to form an opposition. In Sardar's Patel's view its object is to overthrow the government. Socialists do not approve of the deferring of the policy of nationalisation; they would destroy Hyderabad and remove the last vestige of princely rule by annexing the States to India. India should, in their view, at once sever its connection with the British Commonwealth. The success of the party in the Bombay municipal elections alarmed Congress circles. On the other hand,

the miniature election brought about in the United Provinces by the resignation of Socialist members of the legislature resulted in a Socialist defeat. They failed hopelessly to challenge the Congress position in the District Board (County Council) elections in the same province.

The Hindu Mahasabha, the powerful party of orthodox Hinduism, opposed to partition, with its private army (the R.S.S.S.), thoroughly disapproved of Congress policy. One of its members is charged with the assassination of Gandhi. The Congress government in this and other activities of the party saw an attempt to overthrow Congress rule. They struck, and struck hard. The private army was dissolved; thousands of arrests were made. A month or so later Congress was compelled to take action against the Communists, especially in Bengal and the South, where they had captured most of the trade unions and were working on agrarian discontent. In West Bengal the party was banned. The demoralisation of the Police in this province had reached such a pitch that the Home Member felt it necessary to adjure them to deal firmly with evil-doers and not implore them with folded hands to abstain from violence.

The Sikhs have given trouble; in some quarters the Congress are accused of being afraid of them. It is significant that the private Sikh army has not been banned. A settlement has recently been concluded with the Sikh leaders which places the Maharaja of Patiala at the head of the Sikh States, all of which have acceded to India. Congress have apparently not imposed their nominees on the group.

The methods and morals of the Congress party have attracted a good deal of criticism. There are widespread complaints of indiscipline in the services, and among members of the legislature who, it is said, constantly interfere in the administration and force the acceptance of their nominees for official appointments. Such interference in some provinces is said gravely to embarrass official activities. The Bench and the Bar in Madras have recently expressed their apprehension at the growing tendency of the government to interfere in judicial administration. High Court judges have frequently been impelled in the exercise of their power of *habeas corpus* to

order the release of persons detained without trial apparently because they belonged to parties opposed to Congress. In this connection the remarks of the Chief Justice of India, Sir Hari Lal Kania, when inaugurating the High Court of Assam, are significant. The High Court, he said, is the ultimate protector of the people against encroachment on their liberties by the executive. He emphasised the fact that there was no strong opposition to the party in power in the Dominion Legislatures and the need for a vigilant watch on the conduct of the executive by the highest judiciary was greater than ever before.

Many of the elder statesmen condemn indiscipline among students and youth generally. Such incidents as the recent strike of medical students of the Calcutta University on the refusal of the Senate to defer the final M.B. examination are typical.

Whatever the defects of Congress administration in India the framework of the system developed by the British still holds, and that, too, despite the loss of several hundreds of British officers. The railways, posts, and telegraphs are working ; business goes on much as before. The rank and file of Congress still honour their leaders.

The new constitution for India has been drafted and will come before the constituent assembly towards the close of the year. Reasons of space prohibit an analysis of its provisions in the present article. Briefly, a sovereign democratic republic is to be set up, formed by a union of the provinces and States. The President would have executive power and command the defence forces. There would be a two chamber legislature at the Centre and in the provinces. The President would be elected by both Houses of Parliament at the Centre. The system would be based on adult suffrage. The question of whether India stays in the Commonwealth or not is left to later decision. Outstanding moderates such as Dr Jayakar and Sir Jagdish Prasad and, it is rumoured, several cabinet ministers at the Centre would stay with the British group of nations for at least a period of years. There is ground for supposing that many of the elder statesmen are beginning to doubt the desirability of adult suffrage in view of the growth of left-wing parties and the possibility of their working on agrarian discontent, especially in Madras and Bihar. Most competent observers are of

opinion that in any case the Gandhian influence will be strong enough to carry Congress to victory at the next elections. Probably their control of the administration will be equally potent.

Pakistan both in population (about eighty millions) and natural resources comes far behind its great rival. Practically all the mineral wealth of the sub-continent, iron ore, copper, mica, manganese, coal, is to be found in India. As a natural result nearly all the organised industries, engineering, steel works, textiles (cotton and jute), and the production of ordnance stores are in that country. As against this Pakistan has the outstanding advantage that it produces enough food not only for its own population but for export. It has practically a monopoly of jute, though no jute textile mills—they are in West Bengal. Jute and cotton are its main exports and earn for it hard currency.

The financial position leaves much to be desired. The Finance Minister has, it is true, produced a balanced budget. Revenue is put roughly at 60l. million; expenditure at 67l. million. The deficit is covered by fresh taxation. As against this, however, of the Pakistan provinces only Sind is able to meet its obligations. East Bengal has a deficit of 1½l. million, the West Punjab of two. The North-West Frontier has a small deficit. The Centre faces the burden of providing 7l. or 8l. million for border administration.

The Pakistan Government has big schemes of industrial development based on the production of electricity on a vast scale by utilising water power. Projects of the kind have been devised both in Eastern Bengal and the West Punjab. The resettlement of Moslem refugees is a heavy strain on the economic structure, much more so than in India. Of the six and a half millions of these unfortunate people four and a half millions have been accommodated; it is estimated that another year will be required to deal with the rest.

As in India the Constituent Assembly functions as the central legislature. So far no constitution has been evolved; it will doubtless take a democratic form. Politically Pakistan has fewer complications to face than the neighbour Dominion. The position of the Moslem League is practically unchallenged. There is no trouble

either with communism or socialism. So far the six millions of Pathans of the North-West Frontier stand with the League, though there are still difficulties. Thus the Khan of Kelat hoped to recover Baluchistan and independence and at one time was intriguing with Congress for support. He would doubtless have preferred to join Afghanistan. Mr Jinnah cut the ground from under his feet by securing the accession of States in feudal relations with the Khan. He has now acceded. The Red Shirt leader Abdul Ghaffer Khan, a close ally of Congress, overstepped the bounds a few months ago and has been sentenced to imprisonment. There is a prevailing atmosphere of unrest on the Frontier and strong measures have been taken to avoid trouble. The Fakir of Ipi, the Wazir and Mahsud leader, has been intriguing with Congress, but at the moment does not seem to be a danger.

The tribes generally have expressed their readiness to support Pakistan. Mr Jinnah, as was inevitable, has promised to keep up present expenditure (about 7½ million) on the administration of tribal areas, a heavy charge on a slender budget. The Kashmir imbroglio has diverted the attention of the tribes from local politics and so made things easier for the new regime. Had the Pakistan government sought to prevent the irruption of tribesmen into Kashmir the whole frontier would have burst into flame. Pakistan forces might have been driven across the Indus. The only limitation on the strength of the invading *lashkars* is the lack of food and ammunition.

The Pakistan authorities will need skilful diplomacy in handling the Frontier problem. It must not be forgotten that the idea of Pakistan has little appeal to the tribesmen. It was not for them a question of the recovery of independence. As they told Pandit Nehru, they had it already. Their culture, language, and traditions incline them to Kabul rather than to Lahore or Karachi.

The attitude of the Kabul government has been indeterminate. The Afghans made it clear that they expected the Pathans between the Indus and the Durand line to be allowed to choose independence or to join Pakistan. In this they supported the Red Shirt leaders. Obviously the Afghans felt that a Pathan republic on the Indus would gravitate towards Kabul. There is nothing to show that they have changed their minds, despite the

pronouncement of their ambassador in Karachi that Kabul had no territorial claims on the North-West Frontier.

The States in the Pakistan sphere of influence are all Moslem. Bahawalpur, Khairpur (both in the Punjab plains), and the transborder States of Dir, Swat, Chitral, Amb, have acceded to Pakistan. No pressure was applied except, as already noted, in the case of Kelat. It does not appear that Pakistan intends interference in their internal administration.

As already observed, in various matters of mutual interest the two Dominions have come to satisfactory agreements. It is all the more regrettable that the Kashmir and Junagadh incidents should cast so deep a shadow over their present relations. The position in Kashmir has already been discussed. Junagadh is a small State in Kathiawar with a Moslem ruler. It lies on the coast and so in easy communication by sea with Karachi. The Nawab, as he had a perfect right to do, acceded to Pakistan. This India would not tolerate. The State has a Hindu majority; it is closely associated with the other Hindu States of Kathiawar; it was for the people to decide their future. Sardar Patel moved troops into the State and took it over. Pakistan still claims the reversion and has been endeavouring to call in U.N.O. in its claim.

The problem of the defence of the two Dominions has not yet been settled. Much will depend on whether India remains in the Commonwealth. If she does and there is close cooperation in defence between the two protagonists their future might be assured. At present neither could defend its coasts against attack. Left to itself Pakistan could not hold up an attack from Afghanistan supported by the Frontier tribes, much less meet an assault from Russia. It is hardly fair that India should expect her neighbour Dominion to shoulder a responsibility which claimed the greater part of the Indian Army in pre-war days. Obviously India should play her part; in what way is the problem. A solution will only be possible when the parties concerned have come to an agreement over Kashmir. The difficulty would have been more easily overcome had Britain continued to hold Quetta with, for instance, a division of Gurkha troops and various British elements, the cost of which might not unfairly have been borne by the military budget of India.

In 1939 there was only one frontier to defend. To-day danger might threaten from the North East. With Burma in a state of anarchy, Chinese communists might move in and take over the country and thereafter, under Russian stimulus, seek a quarrel with India. With strong Russian backing such a movement might tax the strength of the India army to extreme limits.

The defence of the sub-continent is an international problem. That it should be built upon a sound basis is essential to the existence of the two Dominions. A solution is possible only if the closest friendship is developed between them. For this reason all those who wish them well are anxious to see the Kashmir and Hyderabad problems settled on the basis of reasonable compromise. That India should remain in the Commonwealth and with the Western nations play a part in the peace and well-being of the nations of the world, is the earnest desire of every Englishman interested in that country. Both Dominions may rest assured that Britain will do everything possible to help them in economic development and in other ways to strengthen the ties of friendship and goodwill.

WILLIAM BARTON.

Art. 5.—SHOULD CRIMINAL COURTS PASS SENTENCE ?

FOR more than a century improvements have been made in the treatment of convicted criminals. Transportation has been abolished, the death sentence restricted, sentences to imprisonment made shorter, and much has been done to provide our criminal courts with alternatives to sentences of imprisonment. By stages special methods of treatment have been arranged for young criminals. The life led by those sent to prison has been changed in many ways ; useful work is available and a beginning made in payments to prisoners, out of which they are able to buy comforts ; some provision has been made for giving psychological treatment in prisons and in other places of detention. The Probation system, which optimists regard as conditional forgiveness and pessimists as conditional punishment, has been greatly improved. Care has been taken that those who have been fined by our courts do not drift into prison when they have not paid the sums due from them. Much still remains to be done in regard to those found guilty of crime, but the keenest reformer cannot be blind to the progress that has already been made.

It was inevitable that this progress in the treatment of offenders should result in a demand that those upon whom the responsibility of passing sentence rests should be equipped with greater knowledge. Not much knowledge of penology, or of penal institutions, was demanded when the choice before criminal courts was between a long or a short sentence of imprisonment, or between imprisonment and binding over without supervision. In those days the reform of the offender was not prominent in the judicial outlook. Even to-day there are many crimes that are of such gravity that the protection of society has to be accepted as the prime duty of the courts. None the less, a large proportion of offenders are dealt with on the principle that their reform is one of the main factors that courts must take into account. This being so, it seems obvious that before courts can usefully attempt to reform criminals, they must understand them and the reasons why they have committed their crimes. If, as I believe, this reasoning is sound, it seems clear that improvements in the lot of convicted criminals must be followed by improvements in the education and experience of the Bench.

Already some small steps have been taken in this direction. Thus the second schedule to the Children and Young Persons Act of 1933 demands that only magistrates who are 'specially qualified for dealing with juvenile cases' may do the work of Juvenile Courts. Despite the vagueness of these words, there has been on the whole an improvement in the quality of the magistrates in these courts, though much remains to be achieved. Another step forward has been taken by the Magistrates' Association, in which magistrates of all kinds work together. Definite courses of instruction have been arranged and even examinations held, though the results have wisely been kept secret. There is a growing opinion, from which officialdom has hitherto held aloof, that all magistrates should undergo training, both in court procedure and in penology, before they are permitted to take part in court work. Be this as it may, there can be little doubt that the movement for the education of magistrates will ultimately result in a critical eye being cast upon all those who have the duty of passing sentence on those found guilty of crime. Those who preside in the higher criminal courts—Recorders, Chairmen of Quarter Sessions, and even the judges of the High Court—cannot escape the scrutiny of those who maintain that the wide choice of sentence open to the courts of to-day demands more knowledge and greater training than was necessary in olden times.

Our system of justice has many excellent features and those who study its working are so accustomed to dwell on these features that it may seem ungrateful to criticise it. No one familiar with the principles of criminal trial in this country would hesitate to maintain that he would rather be tried in one of our courts than in those of any other country. But the trial of those suspected of crime is only part of the duties of a criminal court. The other and equally important part, the passing of sentence on those found guilty, has for some time come under the scrutiny of experts, and it is here that criticisms are becoming formidable. The late Dr R. D. Gillespie, of Guy's Hospital, made a study of this part of the duties of a criminal court. His considered conclusion was as follows :

'The impression that a psychiatrist is apt to get of court proceedings is that of a "fact-finding commission" . . . a commission whose scope of reference is unsatisfactory and

limited and whose recommendations as to treatment in consequence are likely to suffer from as grave defects as would the prescriptions of a doctor who is forbidden to have any knowledge of his patient's constitution.' *

Dr R. M. Jackson, who published a valuable survey of justice in this country, described our methods of sentencing the guilty as follows :

'An "experienced" judge means one who is well used to trying defendants and who, generally speaking, makes an excellent job of that side of his duty. But when we come to the passing of sentence, our "experienced" judge is experienced merely in making up his mind and delivering sentence with complete composure.' †

The same could have been said about the criminal courts of fifty and perhaps a hundred years ago. But in this century there has been great progress in the study of abnormal behaviour. New methods of treatment are now available to our courts, as to doctors themselves. Science has progressed and much of what used to be regarded as deliberate sin is now recognised as the effect of internal forces, whether conscious, unconscious or sub-conscious, which can be made to yield to the treatment, if the sufferers are placed in the hands of experts. In addition, much criminal conduct which may not have its origin in psychological forces can be treated on psychological methods, with the result that repetition of such conduct is unlikely. But unless those who have the duty to decide the future of criminals are aware of these important developments, and familiar with the general principles of the new knowledge, progress in the courts cannot keep pace with progress in the realm of science. An eminent psychiatrist, familiar with the working of courts, expressed the following opinion of those on the criminal Bench :

'With all that is at stake in the treatment of young human beings, there are ordinarily less training requirements for those who are expected to alter the conduct tendencies of delinquents, than there are for those who treat sick cattle.' ‡

Dr William Healy, of Boston, was writing of those on

* 'Medical-Legal Review,' April 1939.

† 'The Machinery of Justice in England,' p. 178.

‡ 'New Light on Delinquency,' p. 221.

the criminal Bench in the United States, but his words apply in full to conditions in this country. Some courts of all kinds are to a limited extent making use of psychiatry, but there has been no general realisation of the fact that psychiatry can be usefully applied to a wide range of offenders. Few of those on the Bench are sufficiently acquainted with the new science to appreciate the need for the cooperation of experts in psychiatry. Ordinarily the only knowledge and experience concerning the passing of sentence possessed by barristers who reach the Bench has been derived from attendance in court. I would certainly not belittle the value of such attendance, for in this way is caught the spirit of justice. But if experience consists of nothing more than past attendances in court, the methods and sentences of the past are apt to be repeated in times when new ideas have already established themselves. That is precisely the weakness of our criminal courts to-day. In performing the responsible duty of passing sentence upon the guilty, they are acting in much the same way as did the courts of olden times. Thus modern knowledge has become unduly neglected. Those inclined to doubt the truth of the statements made here would do well to read carefully the courageous book recently published from the pen of Sir Leo Page, a man with almost unique experience of the effects in the lives of criminals of present methods of dealing with them. Before quoting from this book, it is desirable to point out that its author, while excellent in criticism, is weak in his constructive policy. He rightly emphasises the benefits that would be derived if those on the Bench made themselves familiar with our penal institutions of all kinds, but he does not sufficiently stress the importance of their acquaintance with the general principles of modern psychology. None the less two brief quotations from this book should be sufficient to disturb the complacency of the most conservative student of our criminal courts:

'There is nothing whatever in the professional education of a barrister which will fit him to pass sentence.'

'Under present conditions the preponderance of the judges of this country are not required to possess, and do not possess, the skill and the knowledge they should have.' *

* 'The Sentence of the Court,' pp. 163 and 69.

By the word 'judge' Sir Leo means all those who preside in criminal courts. Who of those familiar with the working of our criminal courts can dispute the truth of these statements? The only possible ground upon which they can be refuted is to claim that the conditions of to-day do not require that those on the criminal Bench should have a knowledge of penology, or experience of penal institutions; in other words, that the methods of the days when the Bench had a restricted choice of sentence are applicable to the conditions of the present time. Those who can maintain such an argument must be content with a very much blinded justice.

It is a simple matter to prove that present conditions in our criminal courts in all that relates to the passing of sentence are in need of drastic change. For almost every calendar of a busy Assize or court of Quarter Sessions includes cases where repeated sentences by various courts have failed to deter criminals from continuing in a life of crime. I am not one of those optimists who believe that every criminal can be reformed, but it is the duty of every court to deal with every offender, whether by punishment or treatment, in such a way that society will have the greatest possible immunity from his criminal tendencies. Yet these calendars indicate a widespread failure to achieve this object. As a rule the records of many criminals, set out therein, show long series of short sentences to prison. The courts that sentenced them have made the punishments fit the crimes, but the criminals as human problems have received inadequate attention. In some measure the police are to blame for requesting Magistrates Courts to deal with cases that ought to be sent for trial at the higher courts, for a sentence of six months in prison is the maximum sentence, speaking generally, that these courts can impose for any one crime. But on the other hand, the police have learned by experience that often the higher courts pass sentences that are no longer than those within the powers of magistrates. I am not primarily pleading for longer sentences of ordinary imprisonment, but rather that all courts, when confronted with criminals who have not responded to the sentences given for their earlier crimes, should seek the aid of experts in abnormal behaviour before passing sentence, and not be content to pass sentences of the kind that have already failed. With

many types of first offender such aid should also be sought. Unless it can become the practice of every court to enlist the help of psychiatrists in all difficult cases, there can be little hope of reducing the number of persistent offenders ; and to understand both the need for this expert help and the help when it is given requires training and knowledge, which form no essential part of the equipment of those on the criminal Bench.

The calendars of the court of Quarter Sessions for the County of London have pages that are thirteen inches high. The printed matter is about ten inches high. Quite often the record of crimes of a man tried at this court occupies at least one page of print. I would cite a case chosen at random, a man found guilty on two charges of stealing and on one of possessing house-breaking implements by night ; he was thirty-eight. As a youth he had been sent to an Industrial School for stealing ; this may have indicated that his home surroundings were bad. After his discharge he was sent to a Borstal Institution for burglary and stealing. When released he committed a further crime, was found guilty and returned to Borstal for a period. When finally discharged, he continued his life of crime. When next before a court, he was sentenced to prison for three months. Later the same year a court of Quarter Sessions sent him to prison for another crime for eighteen months. He was now twenty-eight years old. Then followed two sentences, each of three months, three sentences of six months and three more sentences, each for terms not exceeding three months. Then another court of Quarter Sessions inflicted a sentence of twenty-one months. He was by this time thirty-four. When again at liberty there was a pause, whether due to an absence of crime or to the fact that he was not caught history does not relate, but then came a sentence of six months and in the following year he was sent to penal servitude for three years. The next time that he appeared in court he was sentenced to one year's imprisonment and given that rather absurd title, which dates from 1824, of Incurable Rogue. Up to this time nearly all his crimes had concerned property. But in a short time after he was discharged he was sent to prison for nine months for committing 'grievous bodily harm.' Then came a fine, with the alternative of fourteen days in prison, for the

offences of taking and driving away a car and stealing a torch from it. Within a year he was sent to prison by two other courts for three and four months respectively. Then finally the sentence recorded in the calendar for his latest crime was one of five years' penal servitude.

Let the possibility be admitted that this man may have been an incurable criminal; perhaps a bad heredity had combined with defective environment in his earliest years to produce this result. But the courts before which he appeared could not have been certain on this point; they should have made scientific inquiries to ascertain whether any steps could have been taken to lead his criminal tendencies into beneficial, or at least harmless channels. I once heard a psychiatrist, who had held a medical commission in the army during the war, describe how a study of bad soldiers had enabled him and his colleagues to find useful army work for those who had been persistently in trouble and who could never be made into reliable soldiers. One man of this sort became both useful and harmless when put permanently on one of those fatigues that are the bane of many effective soldiers; his fatigue was peeling potatoes, which, if potatoes must be peeled when an army is in the field, saved better soldiers from a boring duty. There are men of this kind in civil life; perhaps the man whose record is set out above was of this type. If so, it would have been well if one of the higher courts before which he appeared had discussed with experts and the prison authorities some solution on these lines and had then inflicted a long sentence. But it is more probable that this man was curable, in which case it would have been better if some court had enlisted psychiatric advice, so as to learn the best method of handling him. No court in this country, high or low, is competent, without much social and scientific help, to deal with such a man in a way that offers a reasonable chance of placing him on the right road.

This case is in no way exceptional. Many similar ones are described in Dr Hermann Mannheim's book 'Social Aspects of Crime in England Between the Wars.' In Sir Leo Page's book, mentioned above, more than thirty pages are occupied by descriptions of similar cases, all of them having been personally known to Sir Leo in the course of his work among prisoners in custody. For many

years the authorities have been worried by the problem of the Recidivist. (The American name Repeaters seems preferable.) The Criminal Justice Bills of 1938, 1939, and of the present year all contained clauses which would enable judges to impose specially prolonged sentences of detention, in some cases up to fourteen years, on recidivists. It is true that the Act of this year, which has now become law, contains a valuable provision that before these long sentences are imposed courts 'shall consider any report which may be made by or on behalf of the Prison Commissioners on the offender's physical and mental condition.' This is a considerable improvement, for it would be utterly wrong to impose these long sentences, even on the worst recidivist, without a previous scientific inquiry into the possibility of treatment. It may be hoped that judges will permit the medical experts in the prisons to be frank in their reports and to suggest affirmatively in suitable cases that a course of treatment should be undergone by the offenders before they are sentenced to these heavy penalties. But past experience does not justify confidence on this point. For many years magistrates have been under a similar obligation before they commit young offenders to Quarter Sessions for sentence to a Borstal Institution; but in the past some magistrates objected to constructive reports.

But Recidivism is only one feature of the problem of unscientific sentences. Countless offenders who have not reached that stage are at present dealt with in a way that is unlikely to result in their reform. Many first and second sentences to prison could be avoided if the aid of psychiatrists could be sought. The Prison Commission is proud of the subsequent record of those sent to prison for the first time; but it has long seemed to me that this pride is misplaced, since the fact that in a high proportion of the cases offenders do not return to prison may also indicate that they need never have been sent there. But in addition to unnecessary severity the present system also suffers from excessive sentimentality. Too many offenders are blindly disposed of by fines, or by placing them on Probation. In each group many should have been thoroughly examined by psychiatrists before their sentence was decided. No one would wish to belittle the value of the Probation system, but sometimes a necessary prelimi-

nary to a successful term of probation is scientific examination and treatment. Probation Officers are invaluable, but many cases are put under their care which should also receive medical treatment.

If it is proved that present day methods of passing sentence are inadequate, what reforms should be considered? In this review I described attempts that are being made by the judges of the Federal Courts in the United States to incorporate the services of experts of many kinds in their work. (July 1946.) The fundamental principle of these proposals is that judges should give a preliminary sentence on those found guilty of serious crimes; then during an interval of six months these offenders would be examined by experts of different kinds, after which a recommendation concerning the best form of sentence would be made to the trial judges; then the offenders would appear in court again and the judges would be free to accept this recommendation of the experts or to pass another sentence; but if the recommended sentence should not be passed, the judges would be bound to express their reasons for their decisions. It is remarkable that such a scheme should be propounded by those on the Bench. There would be a wide response if the judges of our High Court would collectively consider this problem and propound their own plan of reform. The American scheme has many defects, but it is beyond doubt on sound general lines. If its principles could be applied in this country, substantial progress would result. Our present system is not fair to the public, who have to be burdened by the depredations of offenders, who ought either to have been cured or kept in custody for prolonged periods. It is also not fair to the police, who have the task of repeatedly catching the same criminals.

The increase in crime that has followed the end of the war cannot be tackled adequately by existing methods. The best course would be that all who have the duty of fixing sentences should have sufficient scientific knowledge to appreciate the need for expert help and that the sittings of all courts should be re-arranged so that there is time between verdict and sentence for such help to be employed, If this is impossible, courts should be deprived of their powers to determine sentences in many classes of crimes. Expert Treatment Boards would pass better sentences

than the courts ever could, even if those on the Bench were possessed of scientific knowledge. If the fate of the more difficult criminals rested with such a Board, every such offender would be offered such treatment as would give him the maximum chance of becoming a law-abiding member of the public. Offenders cannot be compelled to accept treatment, or to persist in it, but it is not likely that they would refuse if the alternative were a prolonged sentence to ordinary imprisonment. By methods such as these the public would receive greater protection than at present. It is intolerable that the serious crime of burglary, for instance, should be committed time after time by the same man. Invasions by criminals into the homes of our people cause acute distress and when the public comes to realise that, by a more scientific system of passing sentence, there would be many fewer cases of this kind, a demand for such a system might become vocal. At present people are apt to regard their sufferings from the crimes of others in the same way as they regard high taxation or the shortage of the goods that they need. This attitude arises from the fact that at present people are uninstructed. The same considerations apply in even greater measure to cases of sexual crimes, of which young children are often the victims. The sentences ordinarily passed on such criminals offer little hope that they will not repeat their crimes. A Treatment Board would probably be able to handle an offender of this type in such a way that his first detected offence would be his last; some could be treated while they remain at liberty and others would need to be sent to a place of confinement for their treatment. But with our present methods of passing sentence there is little chance that offenders of this kind can change their ways.

There are objections to transferring the power to sentence to expert boards. The public has been accustomed throughout the centuries to the sentencing of criminals in open court. But whether reform be in the direction of having a trained Bench or a Treatment Board, it seems clear that the present system cannot satisfy the needs of the nation.

CLAUD MULLINS.

Art. 6.—ETHIOPIA AMONG THE UNITED NATIONS.

THE first delegation from the twenty-one Allied States to sign the Peace Treaties with the five satellite States, in the Luxembourg Palace in 1947, was the Ethiopian. It was reported that the delegates wore morning coats, white ties, and top hats ; as though to mark the modernisation of the most historical and ancient Empire in Africa. At the Paris Conference, held in the summer of 1946, the Ethiopian delegation made a no less striking impression, because one of its members was a Somali sheikh, dressed in a flowing green robe with a white turban. He marked the special position amongst the United Nations of the one African country which is blended of Christian and Moslem populations, and has preserved its independence from a remote antiquity. He marked also the union in Ethiopia of the Somalis with the Amharas and the Gallas. Abyssinia, as it is commonly called, means a mingling of peoples.

The Peace Treaty with Italy did not finally contain any provisions for the disposition of the Italian Colonies. Nor did it do justice to the claims of Ethiopia, the first of the victims of Fascist aggression, who claims the restoration of the two colonies in East Africa : Eritrea, the coastal province by the Red Sea that had been filched from her in the latter part of the nineteenth century, and Somalia along the Indian Ocean, which in the Middle Ages was a feudal appanage of the Ethiopian Kingdom. The Great Powers, before the Paris Conference and at the Conference, were not agreed about the destiny of any of the Italian Colonies in Africa ; Libya, Eritrea, and Somalia. The principal bone of contention was indeed Libya ; and until that bone is out of the way, the destiny of the three territories has been left in abeyance.

After six months delay, the Treaty with Italy was ratified by the Big Powers and by Italy herself in the summer of 1947. It is now for the Council of Foreign Ministers, the Big Four, who find it difficult to agree on most things, to decide on the disposal of the former Colonies. The deputies of the four ministers in the first place are examining the claims. Prior to the convening of the Peace Conference in Paris, it was agreed that the following solutions should be considered, having regard to the wishes of the inhabitants of the territories and the

views of interested Governments: (a) independence; (b) incorporation in an adjacent territory; (c) trusteeship to be exercised by the United Nations as a whole, or by one of the United Nations individually. A Commission of Inquiry, that last instrument of indecision, has visited the territories to ascertain, on the spot, the wishes of their inhabitants and to study the essential economic and social conditions. The Commission was composed of representatives of the Four Big Powers; and the English member, Colonel Stafford, had considerable experience in Ethiopia, where he was financial adviser of the Government from the military occupation to 1944.

The Commission has reported to the deputies; and the deputies will in turn report to the Council of Foreign Ministers. The Council of Foreign Ministers, if they can agree, will then decide the destiny of the peoples of Libya, Eritrea, and Somaliland. If they cannot agree, they will refer the matter to the Assembly of the United Nations, which, as in the vexed question of Palestine, must with its united and collective wisdom try to resolve the problem.

At present a British Military Administration retains, seven years after the deliverance, responsibility for the government of the territories. That Administration also is still responsible for the government of what are called 'reserved areas' of Ethiopia itself. They are the Ogaden Province in the south-east of Ethiopia, inhabited mainly by Somalis; and smaller districts bordering on British and French Somaliland. The Foreign Office and English colonial servants in East Africa have—or had in 1946—a dream of a united Somalia, which would comprise the former Italian Colony, the British Protectorate of Somaliland, and the Ethiopian province. But any such arrangement, however disguised in the trappings of trusteeship of the United Nations, and however neat it would be on paper, would hardly be compatible with the Declaration in the Atlantic Charter about no annexations. It has provoked the scornful opposition of the Soviet Union. If union is to be realised, the trustee should be either Ethiopia herself or Ethiopia jointly with some smaller and civilised Power that could not be suspected of seeking strategic advantages. The Scandinavian group, or one of them, might be appropriate. Ethiopia, the one inde-

pendent State in Central Africa, has a permanent part to play in the development of self-government of the African peoples of that region.

We have come to the end of a period of white imperialism. In the long view, the interests of the African peoples will be served better by encouraging them to combine in a larger political and economic whole than by splitting them into separate units. If trusteeship there is to be over any of the former Italian Colonies, it should be aimed at guiding kindred peoples towards union.

As to Eritrea, the claim of Ethiopia for direct restoration is simple and strong. The greater part of the Italian Colony was acquired by violent penetration, during the latter part of the nineteenth century, when African colonies were regarded as the rightful appanage of European Powers, and as necessary to their prestige as a pearl necklace to the wife of a magnate. Poor agriculturally, insufficient in food production for her people, without mineral resources, Eritrea with her 800,000 inhabitants was not, and cannot be, an independent political and economic unit. That was stated clearly by Mr Bevin during the negotiations between the Big Four in 1946. As in the past the coastal province, which contains the ports of Massawa and Assab and the healthy highlands, was an integral part of the Ethiopian Kingdom, so to-day it would seem its natural destiny to be linked again with that country. Brigadier Longrigg, the English historian of Eritrea, who was Chief Administrator of the territory after the British occupation in 1941, has pointed out that racially and culturally the Eritrean highlanders are Ethiopians, and that economically Massawa and the coastal plains around it are inseparable from the highlands, and the highlands inseparable from the Tigre Province of Ethiopia. The cleavage enforced by unnatural boundaries which Italian aggression produced is indefensible. 'Every consideration of history, race, culture, language, and economics urges the effective uniting of the two areas.' The two modern ports of Massawa and Assab are the natural outlet of Ethiopia to the sea; and the deprivation of that access has been the principal cause of the backwardness of Ethiopia. A great part of the population in what was Eritrea is composed of Christian Copts, speaking the Tigrinya language that they share with the people

of the Tigre, and ethnically, religiously, and socially one with the people of Northern Ethiopia.

The Italian rulers maintained a rigid colour bar against the native population who were regarded as serfs, hewers of wood, and drawers of water. They were excluded from any part in the municipal government; and the highest posts to which they could aspire in the administration were those of low-paid clerks and orderlies. The Emperor of Ethiopia, on the other hand, has encouraged the young men of Eritrea to take their part in the government of Ethiopia. While the Italians ruled their country, he gave many of them opportunity for modern education. To-day over 1,500 of the Ethiopian Government's officers, military and civil, are Eritreans. During fifty years of Italian rule it was only in Ethiopia that the freedom-loving Eritrean youth could realise any honourable ambition.

It is a strange example of the discontents and disorders of our time, and of the exaggerated demand for self-determination, by any minority, ethnical or religious, that, during the last years, a movement has been spread, amongst the Moslems in the coastal towns and the northern area of Eritrea bordering on the Sudan, for independence from the Christian highlanders. That movement has been promoted by a Moslem League which asks for a period of trusteeship under British Administration as a prelude to independence. The example of Pakistan has encouraged them. How serious is the demand for partition of the tiny land, which is smaller than Wales, the Commission of Inquiry will have judged. One thing is certain: the resistance of almost all the people to the return of Italian rule in any form. Yet a party, known as the 'New Eritrean pro-Italy Party,' has appeared to demand the return of an Italian administration in some form. The members are said to be derived from the old soldiers' association of former Askari of the Italian colonial army. The British military administration left a number of Italians, who were brought into the country in 1935, and subsequently, for the purposes of the invasion of Ethiopia, in responsible positions in the administration. Less than half the 60,000 in Eritrea at the time of the military occupation have been repatriated to Italy. These Italians have exercised an influence, and held out promises to those natives who were formerly in the Italian service, with a view to getting

their support for an Italian trusteeship. France, indeed, for comprehensible reasons, as an Imperial Power in North Africa, and the United States for less comprehensible reasons, proposed, during the tangled negotiations of the Big Four about the Italian Treaty, that Italy should be appointed as the trustee of the United Nations for the administration. That cynical disregard of the wishes and welfare of the native peoples received no encouragement at the Paris Conference, and it may be hoped that, in spite of much propaganda, it will not be revived.

What of Ethiopia herself? Where does she stand in the new World Order? Is she fitted to undertake the responsibility of government of a larger territory? The writer, who visited the country some years ago, believes that the answer is yes; provided that the organs of the United Nations give her that help which they are designed to give to the smaller nations. The progress during the six years since the Emperor has been restored to his Throne, that is, since 1941, is remarkable. For three years he had the help of British advisers to his Ministers, a British Military Mission to train his small army, and a British subsidy to eke out the revenue of a devastated land. Then the Anglo-Ethiopian agreement of 1942 was revised in 1945. The Emperor was granted full freedom in the appointment of advisers, but at his request the British Military Mission remained for the training of Ethiopian officers. The subsidy, which was on a diminishing scale, was completely withdrawn. But the revenue of the country has expanded each year, and has been adequate to meet the growing expenditure. The currency has been reformed; and in place of the Maria Theresa dollar, an inheritance from an age when the size of the silver coin was important, and the East African shilling, a paper token, which competed and fluctuated in value, the Government has introduced a new Ethiopian dollar which has a stable value of a florin. An air-line between Cairo and Addis Ababa runs several services a week; and the railway owned by a Franco-Ethiopian Company, which runs from Jibuti on the French Somali coast 500 miles to Addis Ababa, has been taken over again by the French company in cooperation with the Ethiopian Government. The police and the army, trained on modern lines by British officers, maintain law and order throughout the

territory. Slavery in its last domestic form has been abolished as a status ; and drastic measures have been taken against the last vestiges of the slave-trade.

The most striking advance of all, indeed, has been in education. The Emperor knows that education is the first condition of progress for his people ; even as the massacre of the educated youth and the denial of education to a young generation was the grossest evil that the Italian occupation inflicted. He has been at pains since his restoration to extend the schools, elementary and secondary, and to attract teachers from many countries. Besides primary schools in the towns and some of the bigger villages, he has opened in the capital a boys' residential secondary school for training administrators and civil servants ; a technical school for mechanics, where most of the instructors were Italians but are now Ethiopians ; and a crafts school (originally directed by a New Zealander) to improve weaving, pottery, and home industry. In 1947 a new secondary school was opened in the capital as a memorial to General Orde Wingate, who is venerated as a hero of the liberation. It is staffed principally by English masters. Another educational enterprise was the opening of a law-school for Ethiopian magistrates and clerks and would-be advocates. It was conducted by one of the British judges and his English wife who was herself a solicitor ; and the teaching of the principles of law was conveyed through interpreters. The English-woman died last year, but the school is continuing. The British Council helps to spread a knowledge of English by institutes in the principal towns. Ethiopians must depend at present largely on foreign medical help for the service of the hospitals and public health generally ; but native dressers and nurses are being trained, and a few young men are studying medicine abroad. Besides the English bodies, foreign missionaries, Protestant and Catholic, conduct hospitals and schools. A Swedish Mission, which includes nearly 150 men and women, some of them advisers to the Government, some administrators, some teachers, some doctors, and some technicians, is working in all parts of the country.

The Ethiopian Emperor is sending to England and the United States an increasing number of boys and girls to study at colleges and technical schools. It is character-

istic of his democratic outlook on education that the young Princes of the Royal family have been placed in a Scotch day-school, and not at one of the more exclusive public schools of England. A few of the students abroad have been able to proceed to universities, some in Britain, some in the American College of Beirut. The Emperor contemplates indeed the foundation of a University at Addis Ababa. The site has been allotted, and the plans are made for a Medical School. A hospital, which is being erected with the help of English friends as a tribute to the late Princess Tsaihai—the Emperor's gifted daughter—who was trained herself as a nurse in England, is to be a school for training nurses.

The reform of the judicial system has been carried out. Of old the Emperor, the Rases and chiefs judged cases in feudal fashion. Now a High Court has been established with several chambers, criminal and civil, in which two British and one Swedish judge preside, sitting with Ethiopian judges. The High Court has jurisdiction over all persons, native and foreign. The Supreme Imperial Court, presided over by an Ethiopian Chief Justice, who has the traditional title of 'the Mouth of the Emperor,' is a Court of Appeal. There is as yet no written civil code; but the Emperor has issued a criminal code based on the decrees of the old kings. The code contains the admirable principle that punishment should be graded according to the education and status of the offender. A peasant or a soldier convicted of an offence receives a smaller punishment than an official, a priest, or an officer.

Another aspect of the reconstruction on which the Emperor has embarked is the rebuilding of his capital. Addis Ababa is a lovely city, or rather, a group of mountain villages 9,000 feet up, set in woods of eucalyptus, interspersed with modern quarters, built by the Italians shoddily, as their construction was, but with a few good public buildings. The Italians, in their resolution to turn the Ethiopians into a subject race and make a Fascist paradise for their own colonists, destroyed much of the old town with its thatched huts. They brought also a mass of workers from the countryside and herded them in wretched compounds. The Emperor has turned to the best expert advice for the town-planning. Sir Patrick Abercrombie visited Addis Ababa last year; and his report is to

be implemented by another qualified British architect and town-planner. The elected municipality of the capital has as its director an Englishman who has a long connection with the country : Brigadier Sandford, one of the soldiers who, under Orde Wingate's inspiration, helped the Ethiopian patriots to drive out the Italians and bring back the Emperor. Few capitals in the world have a natural site to rival that of Addis Ababa in scenic beauty ; and under the skilled hand of the planner it may take on a form worthy of its setting. Housing schemes have been initiated ; and one of the progressive measures for raising the condition of the people is the foundation of community centres where men and women are trained to knowledge of hygiene and household crafts.

Ethiopia had hoped to obtain by the Peace Treaty fair reparation from Italy for the material destruction and the moral losses which she suffered in her five years of war and hostile occupation. She put her claim modestly, compared with those of the European victims of Fascist aggression, Greece and Yugoslavia. She did not reap the reward of her moderation. All the claims presented at Paris were scaled down, because, in the awareness of the economic consequences of the last Peace Treaty, it was realised that the vanquished cannot be made to pay for the losses of war without ruin also to the victors. Apart from the compensation for the Soviet Union, the Paris Conference limited the reparations, to be paid in kind, to a value of 225 million dollars. That sum was divided between Ethiopia, Yugoslavia, and Greece. Ethiopia's share was put at 25 million dollars, payable over a period of seven years. She is in addition entitled to liquidate Italian property in Ethiopia which belonged to the Italian State, to Fascist organisations, or to Italian nationals, except such as are permitted to reside. Small as it is, the reparation will help the Emperor's Government in fostering the agricultural, industrial, mineral, and other developments.

Before the Italian invasion the Empress of Ethiopia built a girls' school under her palace walls. The building was turned by the Italians into a hospital ; and they inscribed on its wall a Latin tag meaning : ' I will rise again after a hard fate.' That was an apt motto for the country which the Italians sought to enslave, but which is again a free, independent, sovereign State, one of the United Nations.

NORMAN BENTWICH.

Art. 7.—THE SCOUT MOVEMENT : 1908–1948.

FORTY years ago there appeared on the bookstalls a series of six fourpenny booklets entitled 'Scouting for Boys,' by 'Lieut.-Gen. Baden-Powell, C.B.' They were not very attractively produced, but they at once caught the attention of boys. It was not long before some of these young readers were calling themselves 'Boy Scouts' and worried park-keepers and game-keepers by the queer things they did.

It is easy to understand the initial popularity of these booklets. The name of the author still carried with it the romance of Mafeking. Enterprising publishers of Penny Dreadfuls had already brought out such series of exciting yarns as 'The Boy Scout of Scarletts' and its sequels. Nor is it difficult to see how attractive the scheme of training was to boys—for here was a famous hero actually inviting them to do the very things they were mostly forbidden to do! He wanted them to light fires out of doors and cook, to climb trees, and to learn how to read tracks and other clues like Sherlock Holmes or Sexton Blake. Above all he wanted them to camp.

Many probably thought that all this was a passing craze; some linked it up with the agitation for conscription and saw in the Boy Scouts a subtle attempt to foist military training on the youth of the country. No one would have risked his reputation as a prophet by foretelling that forty years later there would be four-and-a-half million Boy Scouts in the world. Certainly B.-P. himself had no such vision.

His purpose was simple. He had been impressed by the success of the Boys Brigade under the guidance of Sir William Smith. He asked himself, and Sir William, would not more boys be drawn into this excellent organisation if the activities could be more varied and exciting? Sir William's reply was to suggest that B.-P. should work out such a scheme of fresh inducements. At the back of his mind was the experience he had had in training young and rather illiterate soldiers to become sharp-eyed and keenly observant scouts; for them he had experimented with various games and competitions, and his method had worked. Just before Mafeking he had set down in a small handbook 'Aids to Scouting' the details of his method.

(He managed to get the final proofs out of Mafeking just before the Boers completed the encirclement.) He was surprised to find on returning to England that some teachers had used some of the suggestions in this little book. With this manual as his groundwork he began to adapt the practices and methods there described for the training of boys. He thought of the result as something additional for existing organisation to adopt, and not as the beginning of a new organisation. 'Scouting for Boys' was his adaptation of 'Aids to Scouting' but with a considerably extended field of activities.

Within a few months it became apparent that a new and vigorous boys' organisation had in fact started in spite of B.-P.'s first intentions. The numbers of letters he received from boys, and others from men who were being cajoled by boys into calling themselves Scoutmasters, convinced him that some kind of control was essential. So he resigned from the Army in 1910 to give the rest of his life to the Boy Scouts and to the parallel movement for girls—the Girl Guides. The appearance of 'Girl Scouts' (unauthorised) had forced his hand.

In a year or so the Movement had taken root in most of the Dominions and Colonies. This was not surprising, but it was astonishing that many foreign countries also began forming Boy Scout Associations. They too had found in this scheme something that gripped the boys' imaginations in a way more orthodox methods had often failed to do.

Last year, 1947, a Jamboree Camp was held in France. Twenty-five thousand Scouts camped together; they came from all parts of the British Commonwealth and Empire and from forty-five other countries; amongst them were two hundred Scouts from Displaced Persons Camps, for Scouting has been found a valuable aid in training these unfortunate boys of no country.

Not many people outside the Scout Movement itself have a real understanding of its achievement; they see Boy Scouts in the streets and make jokes about Good Turns, but few realise what a revolution in training methods these boys represent, nor what an important part they have played in developing a sense of good citizenship.

Forty years ago the normal method of training boys outside school or work hours was generally based on

physical jerks and sports. This, as B.-P. noted, left a great many boys untouched. His originality lay in seeing the need for other kinds of activities with an appeal to the imagination and leading to more permanent interests in adult life. It was natural that he should turn to those pioneering and backwoods activities that he had enjoyed and had found so attractive to young soldiers. His experience with them also suggested the method—grouping them into small units of half a dozen with one in responsible charge. This is the basic idea of the Patrol.

This, however, does not bring us to the heart of his scheme. The whole was deliberately devised to develop in boys certain desirable qualities of character, not by a series of homilies, but by providing things to do, and games and competitions in which such qualities would inevitably be practised. He drew up a chart (not for the boys but for the men training them) showing common defects in character with the counteracting virtues, and the practical means for promoting them. All this may seem to some to be rather pretentious and even priggish. There have always been some to murmur, 'What does this soldier know of education? What does he know of psychology?' Perhaps it was as well that B.-P. was not a trained psychologist and the victim of changing theories. He was a man of fifty who had seen how men behave in many countries, and had been concerned with training some for thirty years. His own keen powers of observation and his quick intelligence were the basis of this deductions.

It is interesting to note that in a recent book, 'Some Tasks for Education' (1946), Sir Richard Livingstone has written,

'Might we not devise a system of education which shall try to cure the weaknesses to which human beings are inclined and to encourage the virtues which they require? . . . We should decide what virtues we require and the best way to develop them.'

This might be a description of how B.-P. planned his scheme of Scout training. One or two examples will illustrate this.

It is desirable that we should not be selfish. An admirable precept, but for a boy it remains a copy-book maxim until it is translated into action. So in Scouting he begins with the daily Good Turn—this is a habit-forming

practice that can establish a rule of life. Some think this rather namby-pamby, but to those of us with some years of experience of Scouting it is just plain common sense—for we know that it works !

How often have we been exhorted to help those in distress ? This can remain a sentimental feeling of pity, but, said B.-P., instruct the boys in practical first aid, in how to rescue from drowning or from fire, in how to help in emergencies ; this is done not so much by formal lectures and demonstrations as by dramatised incidents (with plenty of artificial blood) in which the Scouts have to deal with unexpected situations. Thus they not only practise the necessary skill, but they learn to keep their heads and do not panic in a catastrophe.

Training in health is again carried out in a special manner. There is little or no drill, and not much time is given to physical jerks. The boy is taught to regard his health as his own responsibility, not something looked after for him by someone else ; he learns simple exercises for practice at home ; he is instructed in simple rules for cleanliness, personal habits, and diet. But the real Scout method is by providing plenty of natural exercise out of doors in games, camping, and hiking.

There are two virtues, or qualities, on which B.-P. put great stress. One was honour and the other self-reliance with a sense of responsibility. He believed that a boy is best trained to be trustworthy by being trusted ; that he can best learn the meaning of responsibility by being given responsibility. This is shown in the Patrol System where the leader of six or seven boys is held responsible for their training. The smallness of the unit here is important ; many boys can have a chance of being the leader ; every member of a Patrol, however young, can feel that what he does counts ; a larger unit is too big for a boy to grasp as his personal concern. Much of the practical training is intended to make the boy self-reliant and not 'leave it to George'—his camping is a good example of this, but it should be noted that it is a special kind of camping. Forty years ago a Loys' camp was run on military lines with paid cooks, mess tents, and so on. B.-P. would have none of this in Scouting. When a Troop of Boy Scouts goes to camp, the unit is still the Patrol—each camping by itself and responsible for its own cooking and management.

Thus each boy gets the maximum experience of all camp work—making fires, cooking, cleaning-up, and so on.

It would be possible to go through the whole Scout scheme and show how B.-P. linked idea with practice. To give cohesion to all and a standard at which to aim, he wrote a Scout Law, rather after the style of the codes of chivalry; this each Scout promises to carry out to the best of his ability. The effectiveness of this is not doubted by those of us who can now talk over with former Scouts who are now men with sons of their own who, very often, follow their fathers into the Boy Scouts. It is not necessary to point out how valuable this code of conduct can prove in an age when there is such a decline in family religious practices or even of belief.

All this sounds rather formal, but it is difficult to express the good fun of it all—the camp-fires, the pioneering, the games in the open country, and the enjoyment of the countryside; and for the older Scouts, the hiking and camping farther afield on the Continent (when permitted) and the meetings with Scouts of other countries.

Scouting has contributed its part to the development during this century of the love of the open air and of nature. Many thousands of town boys have had their first experience of the countryside as Boy Scouts when out on games and expeditions or in camp. When the Movement started, camping was regarded as an eccentric form of enjoyment; its present popularity owes something to B.-P., and many an adult owes his skill as a camper to the training he had as a Boy Scout. In a minor matter, the Movement may also have helped forward a sound development. Shorts and the open-neck shirt were confined to footballers in 1908; even so the shorts were 'decently' long. The appearance of the Boy Scouts helped to popularise a form of dress that now excites no surprise. Scoutmasters who dared to wear shorts in those early days were much ridiculed; most preferred to wear knee breeches, but B.-P.'s own preference for shorts set the example.

Another aspect of Scouting calls for comment. B.-P. devised a scheme of tests for the gaining of badges; he knew that boys enjoy wearing signs of achievement just as their elders do. So he instituted two kinds of badges. The first are awarded for crafts and spare-time interests,

such as gardening, carpentry, or astronomy, and also for special skill in camping, map-reading, and other Scout subjects. A group of these badges is devoted to Public Service, and includes first aid, fire-fighting, and life-saving ; a Scout who gains a selection of these is a King's Scout. The second kind of badge is for progress in all-round Scouting. Some idea of the scope may be illustrated by the requirements of the First Class Badge—camping, first aid, swimming, knowledge of trees and birds, pioneering, signalling, and map-reading, concluding with a twenty-four hour journey of at least fourteen miles over a set route with a bivouac over-night.

There have, of course, been cases of this system being abused and boys have appeared with eruptions of badges like measles, but where properly controlled, the badge scheme does encourage a boy to improve his own efficiency and to acquire the elements of some craft or hobby that may become a lifelong interest.

The Scout Movement has stood the strain of two World Wars. In 1914 it was only six years old but had already spread to many foreign countries as well as throughout the Empire. After the war, the first of a series of Jamborees was held in London, and this was a striking demonstration of cooperation between countries with the same method of boy training. One result was the setting-up of an International Bureau to strengthen the association.

The Second World War was a far more difficult test. In Great Britain Scouts rendered all kinds of public service without becoming a recognised pre-military organisation. Many of them joined the A.T.C. or Cadet units in addition to other duties. The list of jobs done is long and varied ; it includes messenger work, farm and forestry camps, collection of plants for drugs, salvage especially of paper, service in hospitals as orderlies or at Air-Raid Posts, and so on. Rover Scouts (the over-eighteen section) were organised in the Services at home and abroad and in many a Prisoner of War Camp. Old Scouts were delighted to find that, in whatever part of the globe they might be, there were Scouts to greet them and give them hospitality. That work continues.

It was possible to carry on the training of Scoutmasters. The central camp at Gilwell Park was handed over to the military authorities, but camps were run at other centres,

such as Youlbury, the gift to Scouting of Sir Arthur Evans. Many a man working in the factory, or who had to spend long hours at a desk, found that such a training camp came as a complete form of recreation in the best sense of the word. It was inevitable that numbers at first declined, but they began to rise again in 1942; the total membership is now about 425,000 in Great Britain.

Scouting was banned in all countries that came under the domination of Germany. There is indeed something in Scouting that is incompatible with the totalitarian outlook. Such characteristics as self-reliance, independence of government control, the promotion of self-organisation, and the spirit of the pioneer and explorer, are obnoxious to those who want all boys moulded to one pattern.

The principle of managing one's own affairs runs all through Scouting. It begins in the Patrol which discusses its plans for activities and the ways and means for carrying them out. All the Patrol Leaders of a Troop meet in council to plan the programme of training. The Local Association is again a decentralised unit. The Headquarters of the Movement is not a directing Staff issuing orders, but an advisory body. It should also be noted that the number of paid, full-time workers is a very small percentage of the army of forty thousand adults in Great Britain who devote their spare time to the training of the Scouts.

This spirit, and this type of free-association, is at variance with the principles of the one-party state. The efforts of the Germans to suppress Scouting in such countries as France, Belgium, the Netherlands, Norway, and Denmark were not successful. The Scouts carried on and even aided the resistance groups; no doubt they got an extra thrill out of evading men and regulations! So thoroughly did they keep in touch with each other that they lost no ground. In Rouen, for instance, in 1944 I met a Patrol Leader of seventeen who had actually started a new Troop that met by stealth in a bombed-out house or at remote farms right through the occupation.

There have been gains as well as losses. Within a few years of the Revolution of 1917, the Russian Boy Scouts became Pioneers—a very different body in spirit and method. In Italy the Movement was suppressed in 1926, but even there the idea and the memory were kept alive

so that immediately after liberation the men who had been Boy Scouts years before formed new Associations which are now flourishing. British and United States soldiers who had been Scouts did much to put the revived Movement on its feet again in such countries as Italy and Greece.

Losses include such countries as Yugoslavia and Rumania, and, more recently, Czechoslovakia and Hungary. In some other countries the position is precarious. It may seem a curious test of democratic life to look for a Boy Scout Association, but it is true to say that if there are recognised Boy Scouts in a country there you will find free institutions.

These aspects are not well recognised in this country—the birthplace of this world-wide Movement. Most people accept Scouting as a Good Thing; they are used to seeing the Boy Scouts about, but their value is probably not put any higher than as a useful means of keeping boys out of mischief. But unfortunately there are some who deride the Movement without perhaps understanding its principles and achievements. Here are three examples, out of many, of this indirect kind of criticism, that have appeared in recently published books.

In Mr Trevor-Roper's 'The Last Days of Hitler,' he speaks of the 'elementary, Boy Scout nature' of a member of Hitler's court.

Mr Eric Partridge in 'Usage and Abusage,' under the heading 'War Adoptions—Totalitarian,' writes, 'But only the Germans spoke of *strength through joy*, that pretentious phrase which, in the fact, implies a regimented, Boy-Scoutish joy. . . .'

Even more recently Mr Osbert Lancaster in 'Classical Landscape' has written of 'those regiments of ginger-bearded, whey-faced Scoutmasters which infest the Children's Corner in every church in the land,' and in another passage he writes of 'sadistic Scoutmasters.'

Such casual references do much harm; they suggest to the general reader that there is something absurd and priggish in Scouting. The association of Boy Scouts with Germany—one of the countries where they have never taken root—is peculiarly offensive.

Direct and well-reasoned criticism can be respected and answered; indeed it would be good for Scouting to receive

such invitations to defend its principles ; but how does one combat innuendoes such as those quoted ?

It seems a pity that writers whose words carry ideas into people's minds are not more careful in referring to the men and women who are helping in the Boy Scout and Girl Guide Movements. These leaders are of all types ; they are not ' whey-faced,' or ' sadistic ' ; there is nothing regimented about their voluntary service, nor do they promote a false cheerfulness in the boys ; the simple fact is that the boys enjoy their Scouting, otherwise they would not be Boy Scouts ; the choice is freely theirs. And it is at least better to be cheerful than to go about with a long, glum face.

Forty years is long enough for the true character of any organisation to reveal itself ; it flourishes because it has proved effective in developing a desirable type of character in the citizen of to-day and to-morrow.

One quotation may be permitted as a counterweight to the gibes just quoted. An extract has already been given from one of Sir Richard Livingstone's books. Here is a more recent statement by him.

' Britain is responsible for three original creations which in different fields and different ways have had great educational influence—the Public School, the W.E.A., and the Scout and Guide Movements. The latter seem to me to do three main things.

It develops interests and activities for which most schools do not cater and which enrich life and develop character and capacity ; it gives its members that habit of living and working with others which is the essence of good citizenship ; it teaches them loyalty to a great ideal outside themselves.

It is difficult to over-estimate what the nation owes to Baden-Powell and to those who have carried on his work. Nor will the need for the Movement and its importance grow less to serve each new generation as it grows up.'

There we are given a reliable estimate of what Scouting has been doing for forty years. If we cannot share in its work, let us at least cheer on those who are doing the job.

E. E. REYNOLDS.

Art. 8.—AUSTRALIA AND THE ABORIGINES.

PREPARING for Commonwealth Legislation to give a new status to her Aborigines, Australia faces her past shortcomings and her present responsibilities. It is a sad fact that during the 150 years of white man's rule the Aborigines have been reduced from 300,000 to 73,000, i.e. 48,000 full-bloods and 25,000 mixed-bloods. Although, since the middle of last century, progressive legislation has been passed by the various Australian States to give a certain measure of protection to the Aborigines, it was another matter to enforce laws in far-flung territories where only a few white settlers were trying to establish themselves in circumstances which were, in reality, outside the law.

To-day, the bulk of the surviving full-bloods is living in Western Australia (21,821) and in the Northern Territory (13,901), and the Northern Territory is the only State where the Federal Government has assumed control over the natives. The white population there numbers only 8,764 and is outnumbered by more than half. Specialists and public opinion alike have been asking that responsibility for all Aborigines should be taken over by the Federal Government. But this is no easy matter: it needs vast funds and a trained personnel.

Tracing the evolving status of the Aborigine during the history of his contact with the white man, one might list this status under three headings: (1) a slave and a nuisance, (2) a serf and a liability, (3) a citizen and an asset. The first settlers, outnumbered by the native Aborigines, and afraid, shot them indiscriminately, drove them away from their lands or deported them. One great tribal group in Central Australia was reduced within thirty years from thousands to hundreds, and the local tribe of Alice Springs has been completely wiped out. The last Aborigine of Perth in Western Australia died a few years ago. In every State the Aborigines were shot and poisoned in the early years of exploration and development. To-day there are few full-bloods left in the southern territories, 2,700 (and 2,500 mixed-bloods) in South Australia, 690 (and 10,170 mixed-bloods) in New South Wales, and 80 (and 670 mixed-bloods) in Victoria. In the southern territories the white man did not need the Aborigines and saw

no reason why he should suffer or preserve them. It was somewhat different in Western Australia. In the 1860s a few people had gained a foothold in the north-west of Western Australia. The sheep and cattle of the settlers needed plenty of room in a country where vegetation was poor, and the sheep-run of a single settler in the north-west covered an area of one hundred thousand acres. The sheep and cattle ate what grass and growth there was. The root-foods of the Aborigines were ploughed up and the tracks of their waterholes disappeared. As in the south they were driven from their lands. But the settler found employment for them right from the start. By offering the Aborigine food and a few pieces of clothing he induced him to work on his stations. And by the same and other, less positive, means he made him work in the industry which grew up in the North-West, the pearl-fishery. In the 1860s and '70s, hundreds of them were employed as divers on the coast and the white settlers had a certain interest in the preservation of their slaves, for that was all they were. By 1875 a law had been passed by the State of Western Australia for their protection: labour contracts had to be signed properly in the presence of the Police Magistrate, no woman was allowed to work as a diver and no children under sixteen. This was, of course, the barest outline of legislation and left wide loopholes for abuse. In the northern parts of Queensland it was also the pearl-fishery which brought the white man in contact with the Aborigines. But as there was no settlement on the mainland apart from a forlorn one-man outpost at the northernmost point of Cape York Peninsula—the settlement was on Thursday Island—this contact consisted in tentative landings in order to procure drinking water and firewood, and consequent attacks by Aborigines, murder, and punitive expeditions. Farther south, where the country was being opened up and farms established, the natives were shot and poisoned in large numbers. The discovery of gold and the consequent arrival of unscrupulous adventurers hastened the virtual extinction of the Aborigines. To-day there remain in Queensland 8,770 full-bloods and 5,160 mixed-bloods. It was very much the same story in the Northern Territory. Darwin provided a small permanent centre of stability, and out in the bush it was each man for himself. But the slowness

of white settlement in this territory gave the Aborigines a slightly better chance of survival.

If Government Ordinances could do very little in the early years to give practicable protection to the Aborigines, there were nevertheless people at work who had no other interest but to help and save. Missionary work started even in the most forsaken outposts, Beagle Bay Mission in the north-west of Western Australia, and the Mapoon Mission in darkest Queensland. It is almost impossible to visualise their situation. These missions were ramshackle huts set in the wilderness, unprotected and open to attack, with a few people facing whole tribes with cannibalistic tendencies. These early missionaries, Trappist monks in Beagle Bay, were animated by a devotion and a fervour which, unfortunately, were matched by an ignorance of human affairs generally and of the life, customs, and circumstances of the Aborigines in particular which often proved disastrous. Fighting a terrible climate and a poverty and lack of resources which defy description, their efforts to instil the rudiments of civilisation into people, whose language they could not speak, proved almost impossible. But they persisted and continued in their efforts to mediate between the white settler and the Asian immigrants, Malays and Japanese on one side and the Aborigines on the other. Slowly the missionaries gained an influence with the Aborigines and began to teach them whatever they could understand of the white man's ways, and to protect them and their womenfolk, whenever possible, against exploitation and foreign interference, and often against the misuses of their own tribal customs. To-day, fifty missions are at work among the Australian Aborigines, the only schools for full-bloods in the Federal territories are in the missions and the bulk of social and welfare work is done by them.

To Beagle Bay Mission came in 1899 a remarkable woman, Daisy Bates, a journalist of Irish extraction, who was sent by 'The Times' to investigate the question of the Aborigines which had been given some publicity in the British press. She finally settled in Australia and made it her life work to help the tribes in Central and Western Australia. She travelled all over the country, from the Murray River to Broome. She was the only white woman on whom the tribes conferred blood brotherhood; she

learnt to speak 188 Aboriginal dialects and she had a unique chance to study the Aborigines, their religious beliefs, their customs, rites, and the social structure of the tribes.* Far from being an unintelligent and unintelligible being she found him full of a strange ideology all his own, and equally capable of summing up the white man, judging him, and adapting himself to his ways, though this was done from the level of his own untutored observations. Although the Aborigine was a nomad, yet he had a definitely marked territory in which he roamed. This was partly determined by his 'spirit origin.' A man 'dreams' a child will be born to him, and the 'spirit child' which he has 'seen' in this way then passes into his wife. The 'spirit child' is completely divorced from physiological facts and can be born three months or a year after the father has 'dreamed' it. The country where the man has dreamed the 'spirit child,' or Ngargalulla, is called Ngargalulla country and the man can always at once recognise it; after death the spirit returns to the spot where he or she was dreamed; it is a sacred place and the Aborigine's real home. Hence the great importance for the Aborigine to remain in his own country.

In the first decades of this century the authorities became increasingly aware of the problem of the Aborigines and passed new legislation in an effort to stem their decline. Boards were set up for the protection of Aborigines, funds were allocated and Welfare Officers appointed. By now vast numbers were detribalised and pushed out of their homelands which had been turned into farming land, or into mines, and their sacred places had often been destroyed. The natives had mostly attached themselves to the cattle stations on their old lands. They were still working for food and clothing, and what little money they earned was held in trust for them by a white man. From slaves without any rights they had advanced to the status of serfs, whose well-being was, in effect, left completely in the hands of their employers. Some had come to the towns, especially the mixed-bloods, where they worked for the lowest wages. Some tribes were still living in territories which had not been opened up. All of those living in opened-up territory were dependent upon the white man

* Daisy Bates, 'The Passing of the Aborigines.' John Murray, 1944.
Vol. 286.—No. 578. 2 L

for their livelihood. The Government had set aside certain reserves into which only Aborigines were allowed. But these reserves were usually land which was not good enough for white settlement, where the natural food reserves were practically exhausted and where the Aborigine lived the life of a starving nomad. New Aborigines Protection Acts were passed by the various States between 1910 and 1920 ; the Acts had two functions : one was to protect those natives who were working for white settlers on a feudal basis and who were housed and fed, and whose family was housed and fed, by the settlers, against injustice, imposition, fraud, and immorality. The other one was to assist the natives in the reserves and those outside who were either too young or too old and weak to work. Some Aborigines (in South Australia) had been settled on the land ; they had to be provided with stock and implements and all the necessities of life, including health services and educational facilities for the children. The old and sick were looked after, blankets, food, and medicines were distributed to them. Still the Aborigines continued to decrease in numbers and were apparently unassimilable, not understanding the purposes and ends of civilised living, and remained, generally speaking, a liability. In the out-back places things did not improve. In times of drought, for instance, the stock-owners who were employing Aborigines with their families on their stations, drove them away from the stations into territories which had not been opened up and where wild tribes lived. Naturally the bush natives chased the semi-civilised Aborigines back from the bush where they themselves found only a precarious livelihood, with the result that the starving people speared cattle and sheep. For this the settlers rounded them up, imprisoned and punished them. It was a vicious circle. In under-populated territories the white man continued to interfere with native women ; in turn the Aborigines murdered the offender and the end was usually a large-scale massacre of Aborigines by punitive expeditions. Such a massacre by settlers and police took place in Western Australia in 1926. But the time was past when such things could be hushed up, and public opinion stirred throughout the Commonwealth.

It was in 1926 that a Chair of Anthropology was founded in the University of Sydney by the Commonwealth and

State Governments of Australia under the direction of Professor A. P. Elkin, and systematic research began among the Australian Aborigines. Sixteen field workers made studies among the various tribes and Professor Elkin spent three years in the north-west, central, and southern regions, and his reports brought about a fundamental change in the official attitude towards the Aborigines. During the 1930s, 'the governments overhauled their policies and methods of administration.'* In 1933 the National Missionary Council of Australia called a conference of men from all parts of Australia who had practical knowledge of the Aborigines. The conference adopted a 'positive policy,' designed to train the Aborigines 'to become a capable, industrious, and self-reliant people.' This was in conformity with the theories advanced by the anthropologists, upon which it was hoped to base new legislation. 'The white man in the northern and central regions,' to quote Professor Elkin, 'were, and are, unable to carry on their pastoral, gardening or mining activities without native labour.' Surprisingly, but borne out by many testimonies, it appeared that the despised Aborigine, who had for so long been a nuisance and a liability, had the makings of a citizen, and, furthermore, had a rightful and needful part to play in the economy of Australia. He could become an asset. In April 1937 the initial Conference of Commonwealth and State Authorities was held to discuss Aboriginal welfare. It affirmed in principle the following general policy for full-blooded Aborigines: (1) To educate to white standard children of the detribalised living near centres of white population, and subsequently to place them in employment in lucrative occupations, which will not bring them into economic or social conflict with the white community; (2) to keep the semi-civilised under a benevolent supervision in regard to employment, social and medical service in their own tribal areas. Small local reserves selected for tribal suitability should be provided in these tribal areas where unemployable natives may live as nearly as possible a normal tribal life, and unobjectionable tribal ceremonies may continue and to which employees may repair when unemployed. The ultimate destiny of these people to be

* A. P. Elkin, 'Citizenship for the Aborigines.' Australasian Publishing Co., Sydney, 1944.

their elevation to class (1); (3) to preserve as far as possible the uncivilised native in his normal tribal state by the establishment of inviolable reserves; each State or territory determining for itself whether mission activities should be conducted on these reserves and the conditions under which they may be permitted. The solution for the mixed-bloods, suggested the conference, would be absorption by the people of the Commonwealth.

Before any of these plans could mature, the war broke out. The Aborigines, civilised or uncivilised, were suddenly needed. Australia, with seven million inhabitants and the enemy at the gates, could not waste any man-power. There began a quick course in agricultural mass education. Men and women, they learnt how to sow and plant and harvest. The stone-age savage found himself driving a tractor. When the need of the country and the object of his labours were explained to him, when he saw the point and the results of his exertions, the unintelligent, lazy native became quick-witted and industrious. In fact, the Aborigine himself gave proof of the testimony given on his behalf a few years before: he could be an asset.

The individual States did not waste the opportunity and, when the war was over, continued the education of the Aborigine. In Queensland,* for instance, the majority is now engaged in the pastoral industry. Forty-two per cent. of full-bloods and mixed-bloods are living on Government settlements and Church Missions. The remainder are located on country reserves and camps, in country towns, and on cattle stations where they are employed. They are being trained in working saw-mills, refrigeration, building trade, plumbing, carpentering, blacksmithing, road and bridge construction, boatbuilding, and all farm work, including the growing of bananas, tomatoes, pineapples, and all known vegetables. They have hospitals, schools, dormitories, laundries, sports grounds, modern dairies, and training farms.

In the Northern Territory the Federal Government has established a pastoral station for Aborigines at Beswick, south of Darwin on the fringes of Arnhem Land. The station covers 400 square miles and carries 2,000 head of cattle. In two years about 400 Aborigines will receive

* 'Queensland, 1946, Brisbane. Report of Native Affairs.'

training as stockmen, saddlers, agriculturalists, gardeners, butchers, etc. The Government proposes to extend the scheme of training centres and have purchased another property at Gore, Arnhem Bay, where the Aborigines will learn fishing, pearling, and the *bêche-de-mer* trade. (*Bêche-de-mer* is the name of a sea-slug which serves as food in Asiatic countries.) Each Aborigine who has passed through Beswick will be issued with a type of proficiency certificate, indicating what grade he has attained. The station will provide a labour pool for pastoralists.* The Aborigine is indeed on his way to become a skilled worker and an asset.

If he is going to shoulder the duties of citizenship, will he also be awarded with the rights of citizenship? Western Australia has passed an Act in 1944 which grants citizenship rights to natives who can comply with certain conditions. These are: Have you for the past two years adopted the manner and habits of civilised life? Are full rights of citizenship desirable to you and are they likely to be conducive to your welfare? Are you able to speak and understand the English language? Are you free from active leprosy, syphilis, granuloma or yaws? Are you of industrious habits and of good behaviour and reputation? Are you reasonably capable of managing your own affairs? Reporting on this, the 'Sydney Morning Herald' remarks drily: 'Would every white man pass the test of these conditions?' But it must not be forgotten that barely forty years before these Western Australian Aborigines were cannibals, and some of the wild tribes still are. Western Australia has granted citizenship rights to sixty-three natives since the inception of the law; among them are fourteen ex-service men. Applications are coming in at four per week. As regards the granting of political rights in other States, natives are not disqualified from voting in New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia, and Tasmania, but are disqualified in Queensland and the Northern Territory.

However much the individual States may be doing or planning to do to raise the standard and status of the Aborigines, public and expert opinion are pressing for Commonwealth legislature. A National Policy is being

* Hugh Murphy, 'Trade School for Aborigines,' 1947.

considered and the Australian Government has approved in principle new legislation for the Northern Territory which might be adopted for the whole of Australia. This legislation is based on a scheme which has been evolved by specialists who have had long personal experience of the Aborigines and other natives. The new Commonwealth Adviser in Native Affairs, Mr E. W. P. Chinnery, who announced the scheme in 1946, has himself spent fifteen years in Papua and conducted research work and surveys.

The plan * deals with mixed-bloods and full-bloods and elaborates the general policy laid down by the Conference of Commonwealth and State Authorities in April 1937. Provision for the mixed-bloods concerns (1) families in towns who are maintaining themselves, (2) unmarried men and women in towns, (3) dependent children with Welfare Organisations, (4) delinquents, and (5) people living and working outside towns. For families in towns a special living area will be set aside and assistance given in the building of houses, games grounds, club buildings, libraries, and other amenities. Mr Chinnery argues that, although this means some sort of segregation, it is a necessary step in the evolution to full equality and social acceptance by Europeans and will educate the mixed-bloods to become self-reliant and to acquire a sense of stability. They will have their own social activities and meet the Europeans on an equal footing through the provision of general amenities, organised games, and sports committees. They will act as hosts and lose the sense of being tolerated and patronised by the whites. Education will be given in State Schools, convents, and technical schools, and Mr Chinnery plans to set up a technical school in the Northern Territory open to all, white and mixed-blood. After school training, a system of apprenticeships will be provided where necessary. A special Native Affairs Employment Bureau has already been set up. But the mixed-bloods are under no compulsion to find employment through the Bureau and can find work anywhere in the labour market. They have already the full rights of members of ordinary trade unions. Male and female welfare officers will be appointed to carry out regular labour inspections. The main problem regarding unmarried men and women is to find proper accom-

* Edgar Bee, 'New Deal for Australian Aborigines.'

modation for them. Here the Government will provide special hostels, apart from the mission and general hostels, where general amenities will allow the young people to enjoy a social life. The hostel keepers will be trained welfare workers. Technical training and conditions of employment for unmarried men and women will be the same as those for families living in towns. Dependent children will be brought up in mission stations and other subsidised institutions situated in the country. General, technical, agricultural, and pastoral training will be provided, also training in the arts, crafts, and music for specially gifted children. Girls will be trained in domestic science. Training for 'special local industries' will be given, so that the missions will increasingly become marketing points for the local products grown by their pupils. When the children leave their training schools, they are expected to be able to take their part in the normal adult life of the Territory and seek employment in the usual way. If they wish to establish themselves in business the State would assist them with finance, tools, etc. Delinquents are retained at a Government Welfare Station and receive a training which will enable them to take up a normal life in the community after release. People living and working outside towns come under the general labour and welfare regulations, and may get assistance if they want to establish their own business.

The main policy for the full-blooded Aborigines is to keep them in the country and prevent them from drifting into the towns. Here the State is falling back on the reserves which are to be made more habitable and attractive. Government stations will be established in suitable centres for general welfare and training of natives in crafts and industries. A Government field staff is to be built up and suitable young men with training and experience in agriculture, animal husbandry, etc., will be appointed. After a probationary period in the Territory, these officers will take special University courses to qualify them for permanent appointment. Specialists will be appointed for education, care, and general direction of Aborigines. Mr Chinnery has no illusions about the length of time required for any real achievements. But he hopes that the new legislation for the Northern Territory will prove a workable example for the rest of the country.

Here, finally, are the ten principles, set out by Professor Elkin, upon which further general legislation might be based : To secure for the Australian Aborigines (1) a rich community life, (2) health, hygiene, and a soundly balanced diet, (3) the health of mothers, for the maintenance and increase of the Aborigines, (4) the status and dignity of Aboriginal women must be raised, (5) the status of employment should be the same as for white Australians, (6) the understanding of the how and why of civilisation and of Australian life is necessary for progressive citizenship, (7) effective education, (8) justice on a democratic basis, (9) security must be provided in the transition stages from Aboriginal to European life, from nomadism to citizenship, (10) the spiritual life of the Aborigines should be respected.

Perhaps Professor Elkin aims too high in some points, and certain aspects of native life are already forever lost through the economic development of the continent, while too wide a scope of world vision is as yet unobtainable and unnecessary for a people slowly emerging from primitive dreams. But surely the policy as a whole holds out hope for the restoration of a healthy people and the establishment of a valuable Australian community.

ISLE BUNBURY.

Art. 9.—AMERICAN AND RUSSIAN AIR POWER.

ANY precise comparison of American and Russian air strengths is impracticable, the necessary (official) data being absent; all that is possible is to deal in probabilities and approximations. An American aeronautical journal stated in June this year that Russia was believed to have 30,000 military planes, half active and half in storage. ('Flying,' June 1948.) The same journal gave American strength as 23,000 planes, 11,000 being 'on active list' and 12,000 in storage. These figures agree substantially with those given in the Finletter Report of January 1948. In that Report the United States Air Force was stated to have 10,800 'aircraft in active status' and a reserve of about 12,800 left over from the recent war and usable during the next two or three years to replace losses. ('Survival in the Air Age': Report by the President's Air Policy Commission, p. 24.) The 10,800 aircraft here mentioned included, it is clear, much more than first line aircraft in our sense of the term, that is to say, machines which can be put in the air at any time by the squadrons of the air force at full establishment and excluding not only reserve machines but training aircraft also. First line aircraft usually account for only about one-sixth of total aircraft on charge.

The Finletter Report spoke not of 'first line' but of 'front line' aircraft, by which was meant, evidently, up-to-date aircraft of all classes belonging to the Air Force. It recommended an increase of the existing 55 groups of the Air Force to 70 groups, containing 6,869 front line aircraft, with 8,100 in mobilisation store, behind which there would be an Air National Guard of 27 groups with 3,212 front line aircraft and an Air Reserve of 34 groups with 2,360 aircraft. The breakdown of the 6,869 aircraft shows it to include about 2,000 trainers and nearly 1,000 other aircraft which would not count as first line aircraft. According to our way of reckoning the first line strength of the proposed American Air Force would be less than 4,000 aircraft. If it is true that the Russians have a total of 30,000 aircraft their first line strength is unlikely to be in excess of 5,000 aircraft, or about the same number as the Germans had at their peak. It includes, possibly, naval aircraft, which the American figures quoted above

do not. The Finletter Report recommended that the United States Navy should have 5,793 front line planes, corresponding to the Air Force's 6,869, and this should yield a few thousands more of first line aircraft in our meaning of the term.

'The Red Air Force,' Mr Stuart Symington, the Air Secretary, told Congress on April 13, 1948, 'is many times larger than the American would be even with 70 groups.' There may have been in that statement a certain element of propaganda designed to impress his hearers, but even if the Russian is numerically larger than the American Air Force, it is unlikely to be the equal of the latter in fighting capacity. Russian aeronautical *matériel* has always been second-rate, judged by western standards. It was hopelessly inferior to that of the *Luftwaffe* in 1941, and only when it had been stiffened by the introduction of British and American types—Hurricanes, Airacobras, P-40's and Tomahawks—was it able to stand up to the German fighters. The Soviet bombers of that time were slow and inefficient. No doubt the Red Air Force has been and is being modernised now. The M.I.G., which was the best of the Russian fighters during the war, is said to have become jet-propelled, and so, apparently, has the Yak, another single-seater fighter. There is also stated to be at least one four-jet bomber in service, as well as a two-jet bomber. It is not at all likely that they have the preference of the four-jet bombers which have been under construction in the United States—a six-jet bomber is also being developed there—or that the fighters are the equal to the F-80 (Shooting Star), the F-84 (Thunderjet) or the F-86, which is said to be the fastest of all.

Numbers matter, but quality matters most in the air; and there is in the last resort something that matters more than either. What was it that broke the *Luftwaffe* in the late war? It was neither quantitative nor qualitative inferiority. The *Luftwaffe* was a larger force at the beginning of 1945 than it had been in 1939. It had in the FW-190 a fighter as good as any machine of the piston engine type which the Allies had in service, and in jet fighters it was better equipped than were they. Yet it was down and out, done for, grounded. Why? Because it lacked its life-blood: oil.

One of the most impressive lessons of the war was that

the best, and indeed the only certain, way to drive an enemy out of the air was to deprive him of oil. It was the tremendous onslaught on Germany's synthetic oil plants, refineries, and benzol plants which, more than anything else, reduced her before the end of the war to the position of a country without any air force at all. The extraordinary situation thus produced had not been generally foreseen before the war: one in which a powerful air force, well equipped, full of fight, had become earth-bound and useless. How it actually came to pass is still not as fully understood as it should be. If it were, we should hear less of some factors of air power which are of secondary importance and more about one which is absolutely vital—the question of fuel supplies.

Russia came very near to being knocked out of the war in 1942. That was her year of destiny. It was touch-and-go whether she survived or went under. The danger point for her was not where it seemed to be, at Moscow, still less at Leningrad; it was far away to the south, in the Caucasus. The fate of the Caucasus was Russia's fate too. It was for the Caucasus that the terrific battles were fought on the Don in that year, that the Germans battered so long at Stalingrad, that they stormed Rostov and pressed on past Maikop. For in the Caucasus there was to be won that glittering prize which made all endeavour worth while—oil.

Nearly 90 per cent. of Russia's oil came from that region, mainly from the Baku district. Of the total output in 1938 of 32 million metric tons about 29 million tons were produced in the Caucasus, that is to say, in Azerbaijan and in the Grosny and Maikop oilfields to the north of the mountain range. A great effort had been made before 1939 to develop the oilfields between the Volga and the Urals, but it had proved to be disappointing; only two million tons were produced in 1939. Other oil wells in Kazakhastan, Turkmenistan, Uzbek, and the Far East yielded negligible quantities only. For all practical purposes the Caucasus represented Russia's source of liquid oil. It was also the chief refining centre of the Soviet Union.

A critical shortage of oil would have had a doubly disastrous effect upon Russia's resistance. Her armies and her air force would have had to go on short measure.

Over and above that, her agriculture would have suffered a crippling blow. The collective and state farms depended upon oil-driven tractors. The mechanisation of farming had been developed since 1928, when the first machine-tractor stations were established, on a scale unapproached in any other part of the world. 'Nowhere in the world on the eve of the second world war was there such an abundance of agricultural machinery, including the most complex appliances, as in Soviet Russia. . . . In the United States only 21 per cent. of agricultural units used tractors, in Russia 93 per cent.' (David J. Dallin, 'The Real Soviet Russia.' Translated from the Russian by Joseph Shaplen, 1947, pp. 30, 31.) In 1940, according to Dr Baykov, there were 6,980 machine-tractor stations in Russia, and 523,000 tractors in use. (Alexander Baykov, 'The Development of the Soviet Economic System,' 1947, p. 331.) A considerably lower total for tractors is given in another account, which states that 137,000 tractors were destroyed or seized by the Germans and that this number was 30 per cent. of the pre-war total. ('World Economic Conditions,' Carnegie Endowment Publication No. 440, April 1948, p. 264.) Without oil all this elaborate organisation would have been brought to a standstill, and the result would have been famine conditions throughout a great part of Russia.

The Caucasian oil wells, Ribbentrop told Ciano at the time, were the politico-military objectives in the campaign of 1942. 'When Russia's sources of oil are exhausted, she will be brought to her knees.' ('Ciano's Diary,' p. 462, quoted by Gen. J. F. C. Fuller, 'The Second World War,' p. 230.) Russian resistance could not have been maintained if the oil wells and refineries had been lost to her, and they would have been lost if it had been possible for the Germans to do in 1942 what they did at Kertch in May 1943. They captured that immensely strong position by massing against it a huge concentration of aircraft as well as tanks; German reports spoke of 2,000 dive-bombers being in action on a front of twelve to fifteen miles. Nothing could have stopped the advance towards the Caspian if the assault could have been launched on the same scale a year before. But it could not be. The Germans had had to send elsewhere the aircraft that were needed for it.

They had been far too strong in the air for the Russians in 1941. In 1942 the Russians began to gain the upper hand. That change was due mainly to two causes. First, the best of the German formations on the eastern front, Kesselring's 2nd Air Fleet, had to be moved to Italy and Sicily to safeguard Rommel's supply route. Secondly, many squadrons of fighters had to be brought back to Germany to defend the Reich against the British air raids. Our bombing policy in that year was definitely directed, Sir Archibald Sinclair stated in the House of Commons on March 4, 1942, 'to give the utmost possible help to our Russian Allies in their gigantic battle against the main German armies.' It was in pursuance of this policy that our bombers raided Lübeck and Rostock, the supply ports for the eastern front, in March and April 1942. Bath, Exeter, Norwich, and York paid for these attempts to help Russia, but that did not deter us from continuing our bomber offensive, nor did the fact that we were ourselves fighting for life in the Atlantic at that time. The direct result of our air offensive was a shortage of German fighters on the eastern front in 1942. In the spring and summer of that year the *Luftwaffe* was weak in fighters on that front; 50 per cent. of its twin-engine fighters were contained in the west by Bomber Command's attacks. (Asher Lee, 'The German Air Force,' 1946, pp. 109, 111.) The German weakness in fighters, says Lieut.-Colonel Accart ('Bataille dans le Ciel Russe,' in 'Forces Aériennes Françaises,' April 1948, p. 12), was a 'decisive factor in the issue of the operations' in Russia in 1942. To it was due, he states (p. 19), the failure of the *Luftwaffe* in a campaign for which, as a tactical air force, it was particularly well adapted.

The Germans, whose object was to capture and use the oilfields and refineries, did not bomb them, though they did bomb the oil tankers on the Volga, and mined that river also. (Alexander Werth, 'The Year of Stalingrad,' 1946, p. 154.) Baku itself was, in fact, in greater danger in this respect in March 1940. The British and French had then a plan for bombing it, according to the Swedish official publication dealing with Sweden's neutrality and her refusal of passage to Allied troops going to help Finland against Russia. If it had been bombed, little harm would probably have been done to it. Our raids on oil targets

in the Reich later in that year gave disappointing results. It was a very different matter in 1944-45 when the bombers were more numerous, the bombs heavier and navigational and aiming devices improved. In a future war the refineries at Batoum could not survive a heavy attack by American bombers based on the eastern Mediterranean. The distance would be not so great as that which the Liberators of the 9th United States Army Air Force had to cover when they raided Ploesti from their base in Egypt on Aug. 1, 1943, and destroyed 50 per cent. of the refining capacity there. Ploesti was raided again on a number of occasions by the 15th Air Force from Foggia in Southern Italy and by August 1944, when it was captured by the Russians, the output had practically ceased as a result of the air attacks. Photographs of the tremendous havoc wrought by the 15th Air Force in the Concordia Vega refinery at Ploesti may be seen in the 'Second Report of the Commanding General of the United States Army Air Force to the Secretary of War,' Feb. 27, 1945, pp. 40, 41. American Liberators and British Wellingtons also mined the Danube and in this way were able to interfere with the transportation of such oil as was produced at Ploesti.

The Caucasian oil is distributed in part by means of tankers on the Volga, and this traffic could also be interfered with by the laying of mines in the river. It would be by means, however, of heavy and sustained attacks on the refineries and their accessories that an oil famine could be produced most effectively. The synthetic oil plants which the Russians have fostered in eastern Germany could not make up for the loss of their own supplies. They might obtain a few million tons from the Rumanian oil fields—until Ploesti was eliminated again—but that, again, would not fill the gap. The Caucasus is the Soviet heel of Achilles and it is there that a mortal blow can be struck.

But will it remain the chief source of supply? Of that there seems to be little doubt. The Five Year Plan for the period 1946-50 showed it to be still the largest centre of production. The region between the Urals and the Volga was the only other source approaching it in importance, and there it is evident that much work of development remains to be done. The total oil target for 1950 is 35,400,000 metric tons from all Soviet sources, or

about three million tons more than production in 1939—an indication that there has been no great enlargement of the sources. The actual production in 1947 was only 24,500,000 tons ('World Economic Conditions,' Carnegie Endowment Publication No. 440, April 1948, p. 270), so that there is a good deal of leeway to be made up before even the pre-war position is restored. It is safe to predict that within any foreseeable time Russia will have to rely on the Caucasus region for something in the neighbourhood of 75 per cent. of her liquid fuel. In this respect her eggs will be nearly all in one basket; those stored elsewhere would make very short commons for the hungry mechanical mouths waiting to be filled.

The Caucasus would be vulnerable, of course, only if an enemy had a jumping-off place for attack upon it. Would the American Air Force have such a place? The probability is that it would. In any clash between east and west it is unlikely in the extreme that the west would be the aggressor and would therefore disentitle itself to the right which the Charter of the United Nations gives a victim of aggression to claim certain facilities from other members of the Organisation. A decision of the Security Council might be blocked by the interposition of the veto of the Soviet delegate, but that would not prevent action in 'collective self-defence' by a group of States which had concluded regional pacts of security within the framework of the Charter. Under the Vandenberg resolution adopted on June 11, 1948, the American Senate approved in principle the participation in such pacts of the United States, and the State Department may be expected to take action accordingly in any region in which American interests are considered to be affected. One such region is the eastern Mediterranean; that fact is evident from the military and economic assistance already afforded by the United States to Greece and Turkey. These and, indeed, other States which are members of the United Nations could be expected to provide bases and air passage under the terms of the Charter; the obligation to do so would override any prohibitory rule of the international law of neutrality.

Would not Russia try to recoup herself for the loss of Baku by invading Iran and Iraq and seizing the oilfields in those countries? It would profit her little to do so. They would be of little value without refineries, and

Abadan and Haifa would be even more vulnerable than Batoum. These places would be no longer 'neutral' if they came under Soviet occupation. The British and American bombers did not hesitate to attack oil installations as well as railway junctions and bridges in France during the recent war.

American oil would not be similarly exposed to Russian attack. It is true that the United States is now an importer of oil from the Middle East, and that supply would be lost, no doubt; but the United States and Venezuela still produce between them nearly 75 per cent. of the world output of oil, and that should be enough to ensure that the American war effort was maintained without relaxation.

A country's air potential is conditioned ultimately by its oil potential. Among the elements which go to make up the complex known as air power not the least important is the possession of a sure source of the fuel supplies without which the power could not be exercised at all. These supplies are needed too, of course, for naval and military prime-movers, which also would be prime-movers no more without them. But it is air power, not sea or land power, that is the subject of this study. Its purpose is to show that in a clash of American and Russian air power—a clash which is not for a moment suggested to be inevitable—the issue may depend on a factor which is sometimes not taken sufficiently into account and which the last war showed to be the most decisive factor of all.

J. M. SPAIGHT.

Art. 10.—THE AMERICAN LABOUR FRONT.

THORSTEIN VEBLEN, the eccentric genius, whom many people count the ablest economist ever produced by the United States, in his book 'The Nature of Peace and the Means of its Perpetuation,' written just after the close of the First World War, predicted that the Russian Revolution, which he described as 'an uprising of the common man,' would, even if it did not realise all the objectives of its promoters, have a profound impact upon the outlook of the working-classes in every country, including the United States, and would stimulate them to demand a new organisation of society, which would give them better terms of life. So it is an interesting coincidence that the ascent of the United States to be the only power of sufficient strength to face on equal terms Russia, the fountain-head of the revolutionary movement of Communism, should be accompanied by the upsurge inside the United States of a labour movement, organised in trades unions and now embracing some 16,500,000 workers, which is being gradually permeated with class-consciousness and is capable of effective political action. This labour movement has a long and chequered history, which deserves some narration before its prospects and possibilities are appraised.

The first organisation of labour in the United States dates back to the early days of the Republic, when in the last decade of the eighteenth century the carpenters and shoemakers of Philadelphia, the printers of New York, and the tailors of Baltimore formed societies, which had most of the earmarks of modern trades unions. They bargained over wages and hours, insisted upon 'closed shop' conditions, engaged in strikes, picketing, and boycotts, paid strike benefits, regulated the system of apprenticeship, and employed 'walking delegates' as watchdogs over their interests. During the first quarter of the nineteenth century this type of organisation spread to other crafts and to other cities, but the growth of trades unionism was slow, until it received a marked stimulus during the era of economic expansion, which followed the discovery of gold in California in 1849; numerous new unions were formed and the typographers and moulders took steps to create nation-wide organisations. But the

depression, which began in 1857 and continued until the outbreak of the Civil War in 1861, depleted the treasuries and impaired the morale of the American trades unions so seriously that most of them ceased to exist.

The bouleversement of the Civil War, which drew thousands of the younger workers into the fighting forces of both sides, was an obstacle to the revival of trades unions, until during the later stages of the war the sharp rise in prices and costs of living in the northern states, caused by the lavish issuance of 'greenback' currency, impelled the workers to reorganise their trades unions as instruments for raising wages to a level adequate for their needs. As the result of their success the trades union movement gained momentum after the war and national craft unions were organised by the locomotive engineers, tailors, bricklayers, painters, carpenters, and bootmakers, the union of the last-named, which had the grandiloquent title of the Knights of St Crispin, having the largest membership, 50,000. In the years which followed various efforts were made to evolve a solidified nation-wide organisation for all the American trades unions and a certain measure of success was attained by an organisation called the Knights of Labour, which was started by a group of tailors in Philadelphia in 1869. It was an impressive mass movement, which included workers of all trades and degrees of skill and a body of discontented farmers and it reached the peak of its strength in 1886 with a total membership of some 700,000—organised in 5,500 local assemblies. But a series of disastrous defeats in strikes and the steady secession of skilled workers, who disliked the mixed character of the personnel of the assemblies, to form their own craft unions, diminished the membership of the order to such an extent that by the late nineties of last century it had waned into insignificance. But in spite of its weaknesses and apparent failure, it had the distinction of being the first national labour organisation in the United States and it made a valuable contribution to the education of the working-classes, who learnt through it the merits and demerits of the 'One Big Union' type of organisation. Moreover it helped to make the general public conscious for the first time that large sections of the industrial workers were bitterly discontented with their lot and had some genuine grievances.

It was the conflict of interests, which developed inside the Knights of Labour between the skilled artisans working with tools and the mass of semi-skilled and unskilled wage-earners, which moved the leaders of the craft unions to create in 1881 the Federation of Organised Trades and Labour Unions, rechristened five years later the American Federation of Labour. In its organisation one of the leading spirits was an able London-born Jew, Samuel Gompers, a cigarmaker by trade and, after he was elected its first President, he achieved such a dominating position in its councils that, except for one single year, he retained his important office until his death in 1924 and was a person of great consequence in the United States.

In the structure of the A. F. of L., as it is called in common parlance, each craft was allowed complete autonomy. Each national union has its own constitution, its own rules for internal discipline, and its own procedure for dealing with employers, and its membership is rigidly restricted to persons directly connected with its craft. For nearly twenty years after its formation the growth of the A. F. of L. was so slow that it could only show a registered strength of some 350,000 members in 1899, but a concerted campaign of organisation, which produced some two dozen new national and international unions, Canadian workers being included in the latter, brought its total membership up to 1,675,000 in 1904. Many employers were now compelled to take the A. F. of L. seriously for the first time, and its growing power aroused the violent opposition of most of the large corporations, which had by this time begun to acquire great importance in the national economy of the United States. But the failure of the A. F. of L., then an aristocracy of well-paid workers, to show any serious concern for the interests of their less fortunate brethren resulted in 1905 in the organisation of the Industrial Workers of the World, a leftist body committed to direct revolutionary tactics and opposed to collective bargaining with employers. It was a 'One Big Union,' whose membership was recruited chiefly from the ranks of the Western Federation of miners, the unorganised workers in the western wheat-fields and lumber camps, and the low-paid textile workers in the Eastern states. Its methods of violence in industrial disputes tended to weaken public sympathy for the

grievances of labour and, when after the outbreak of the First World War its leaders adopted a pacifist attitude and engaged in subversive anti-war activities, which landed most of them in gaol, it faded away to the great relief of the chieftains of the A. F. of L.

During the first three decades of the nineteenth century the American labour movement experienced great vicissitudes in its fortunes. At intervals the leaders of the A. F. of L. would organise vigorous drives to enlarge the net of unionisation and met with considerable success. Then the employers, frightened by the growing power of the unions, would organise a counter-offensive to check their progress. The puissant United States Steel Corporation after its formation adopted an anti-union policy and crushed out of existence the union of iron and steel workers, and employers in other industries followed this lead. In their intermittent campaigns against the unions they were aided and abetted by manufacturers' associations, boards of trade, chambers of commerce, so-called 'citizens' alliances and sometimes by agrarian organisations like the National Grange. One line of anti-labour strategy was for distributors and merchants to confine their purchases to goods produced in 'open shops' and another was the formation of 'company unions,' a device, whose invention is credited to Mr Mackenzie King, the present Prime Minister of Canada, during the period when he was in the employment of the Rockefeller Foundation. These 'company unions,' whose total membership was in 1928 as high as 1,500,000, were anathema to the trades unions, who alleged with some justice that they were completely dominated by the employers.

But labour unrest and the violence, which attended industrial disputes, forced the United States Government to take a greater interest in industrial relations. In 1913 the Taft Administration made provision for a Minister of Labour, whose special duty was 'to foster, develop, and promote the welfare of the wage earners of the United States.' It fell to President Wilson to appoint the first Minister of Labour, a Scot called W. B. Wilson, and he followed up this move by securing in 1914 the passage of the Clayton Act, which aimed to free labour from judicial persecution under the anti-Trust laws. Other efforts of President Wilson to translate into legislation the doctrines

of his 'New Freedom' creed were beneficial to labour and in return for the assurance of wholehearted cooperation in the national war effort, which the A. F. of L. gave immediately after the outbreak of the First World War, the principle of labour representation on governmental committees was accepted for the first time and an impartial National Labour Board was established to prevent and promote the settlement of industrial disputes. So during the First World War the position of the organised labour movement in the United States was materially strengthened and, since unions were now able to offer more tangible benefits to their members, a steady recruitment brought their total membership in 1920 up to slightly over 5,000,000, a figure which was not exceeded again until 1937.

But when the Republicans recovered power under Harding in 1920, the employers were encouraged to begin another anti-union crusade, which inflicted so many reverses upon the unions that by 1924 their total membership had fallen to 3,500,000, and was reduced to below 3,000,000 after the great depression befell in 1929. The tide, however, began to turn in favour of labour when the Democrats recaptured control of Congress in 1930 and passed the Norris-La Guardia Act, which declared the right of the workers to self-organisation and collective bargaining to be the public policy of the United States, and banned the issuance, without open hearings, of legal injunctions against the exercise of this right.

In the Presidential election the workers of the United States voted almost solidly for Roosevelt and the Democratic party and their faith in them was rewarded, when Roosevelt launched his 'New Deal' programme, through the National Industrial Recovery Act, passed in June 1933, with the revival of employment and purchasing power as its objectives. In addition to providing for a comprehensive programme of public works, this act prescribed that each industry must establish codes of fair competition, which were to include minimum working standards, increased wages, shorter hours, and the complete prohibition of child labour. In the preparation of these codes labour was given an advisory status and its influence upon their terms was variable, being very important in the mining and clothing industries and insignificant in others. And for the labour union an

equally vital part of the Act was Section 7 (a) which required that each industrial code must contain a provision that 'employees shall have the right to organise and bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing and shall be free from the interference, restraint or coercion of employers in the designation of such representatives.' Labour boards were also created to deal with disputes arising from the interpretation of this act and to conduct elections for the determination of bargaining representatives. Such a wave of activity among the unions was started by the passage of this measure that within two years the aggregate membership of A. F. of L. unions had risen by over 40 per cent. to over 3,000,000 and the Railway Brotherhoods had experienced a parallel expansion.

A decision of the Supreme Court in June 1935 that the National Industrial Recovery Act was invalid was a disconcerting setback, but a few months later Congress repaired the damage by the passage of the National Labour Relations Act, which confirmed the unions in their rights about organisation and collective bargaining and created a Board armed with semi-judicial powers to interpret and determine unfair labour practices. Roosevelt, faced with the persistent hostility of most of the upper classes of Americans, took a keen delight in promoting the interests of labour, and many employers charged that it was the petted child of his regime.

When the National Recovery Industrial Act gave an impetus to the organisation of unions in the great industries engaged in mass production, the issue of craft versus industrial unionism became acute. At the annual convention of the A. F. of L. in 1934 the delegates after a controversial debate passed a resolution which, while recognising a change in the nature of the work performed by millions of workers in industries, in which it had been impossible or very difficult to organise craft unions, pronounced for a policy which would safeguard fully the jurisdictional rights of such unions. At the next annual convention the same controversy recurred with increased bitterness on both sides, and the opponents of industrial unionism, prevailing in the crucial vote by 18,024 to 10,933, denied jurisdiction coextensive with the whole industry to the unions organised in the motor, rubber,

radio, and some other industries. This defeat led the Presidents of eight A. F. of L. unions, which favoured industrial unionism, to create a 'Committee for Industrial Organisation' for the purpose of encouraging and promoting the organisation of the unorganised workers in mass production and other industries upon an industrial basis. The adhesion of several other important unions followed and the membership of the new body received additional reinforcement from factions, which deserted A. F. of L. unions and from new groups of workers, who organised themselves for the first time.

One circumstance very favourable to the rapid growth of the new organisation was the virtual cessation of immigration into the United States during the First World War and its drastic curtailment under a plan of limited quotas during the post-war era. As long as a great mass of unskilled or semi-skilled workers in the United States were immigrants from the continent of Europe, who not only did not speak English or understand it, but were also quite satisfied with wages relatively high by comparison with their former earnings in their native countries, it was very difficult to recruit this class of worker for trades unions and they were mostly very susceptible to the threats of employers. But by 1935 the great majority of the foreign immigrants had become at least partially Americanised and had acquired some command of English, and their children, who had reached working age, were in their speech, outlook, and ways of life almost indistinguishable from Americans of native stock. So the process of organising the lower ranks of labour had become enormously simplified.

Naturally the conservative leaders of the A. F. of L. looked askance at the new rival organisation and, after solemnly condemning it as a divisive upstart, which menaced the real interests of labour, it ordered the unions adhering to the C.I.O. to withdraw from it and, when they refused to obey this edict, excommunicated them. When the breach between the two labour factions was widening, President Roosevelt and his Secretary for Labour, Miss Frances Perkins, as well as other interested persons of influence, made strenuous efforts to heal it, but without any success, and the cleavage in the labour movement became final, when in November 1938 thirty-two inter-

national unions and nine organising regional committees along with the city and state bodies giving allegiance to the C.I.O. met in constitutional convention and established the Congress of Industrial Organisation. One of the chief architects of the C.I.O. was Mr John L. Lewis, a miner of Welsh blood, who, as head of the United Mineworkers, had for many years exercised almost despotic control over the policies of this powerful union and who was and still is in his declining years one of the most dynamic figures in the labour world of North America.

Mr Lewis was elected the first President of the C.I.O. and was an ardent supporter of President Roosevelt until, before the election of 1940, he had a bitter quarrel with the President, partly on personal grounds and partly over foreign policy. But, when he exerted his influence in the election in favour of Wendell Willkie and the Republican party, the great majority of the members of the C.I.O., including many who belonged to Lewis' own union, remained staunchly loyal to Roosevelt. So Lewis, piqued by this rebuff, interpreted it as a vote of no-confidence in himself and, resigning the Presidency of the C.I.O., engineered the withdrawal of his Mineworkers' union from it. His first application for its readmission to the A. F. of L. was rejected, but a second was accepted and, as a reward for bringing back the mineworkers to their original fold, he was elected a Vice-President of the A. F. of L. But his arbitrary temper and his somewhat quarrelsome disposition made him a very difficult bedfellow and, when his colleagues refused to conform to his wishes in regard to the policy to be adopted toward the new labour code prescribed by the Taft-Hartley Act, he tendered his resignation as Vice-President and has since been leading his own special flock along an independent path. His prestige with them has been recently increased by his remarkable success in extracting from the mineowners valuable concessions for their benefit and, although he is now an ageing man in enfeebled health, he remains one of the most formidable figures in the American labour movement, distrusted but feared by the leaders of both the A. F. of L. and the C.I.O. and courted by many politicians.

His successor as President of the C.I.O. is Mr Philip Murray, a steelworker, who was born in Scotland and is

a Roman Catholic. Although he does not possess Lewis' flair for dramatic oratory and capacity for organisation and swift action, he is a very creditable type of labour leader, shrewd, sane, and even-tempered and, if notoriously cautious, very tenacious in upholding the rights of labour. He enjoys the complete confidence of the great majority of the members of the C.I.O. and he has so far been very successful in frustrating the designs of the Communist elements inside it. The C.I.O. is fortunate, too, in having a number of able young leaders, among whom the outstanding figure is Mr Walter Reuther, the head of the Automobile Workers' union. At intervals moves have been for a reconciliation of the two factions, but such conferences as have been held on the subject have proved abortive and so organised labour is to-day divided into the following groups: The American Federation of Labour, The Congress for Industrial Organisation, The Standard Railway Brotherhoods, which have always ploughed their own furrow, and Mr Lewis' United Mine-workers, whose union has been trying persistently to recruit members from industries and trades claimed both by the A. F. of L. and the C.I.O. Data compiled by the U.S. Department of Labour showed that at the end of 1947 the A. F. of L. had roughly 8,000,000 members, the C.I.O. 6,000,000, and the independent unions about 1,800,000, and the total union membership probably now exceeds 16,500,000.

The result of the formation of the C.I.O. has been the more active participation of labour in politics, because its leaders are convinced that vigorous and sustained political action is essential for safeguarding the interests of the workers. At its foundation the American Federation of Labour decided to adopt in politics a non-partisan policy upon the theories that, firstly, partisanship in politics would create dissension in its ranks and divert the attention of its members from their economic problems, secondly, that official neutrality was the most effective method of securing concessions for the workers, because candidates of all parties would have to bid for their support and, thirdly, that identification with the cause of any one party would be disastrous for labour, if that party was defeated. For many years the Republicans' policy of high protectionism won the votes of a multitude of in-

dustrial workers, but the general policy of the A. F. of L. was to support at elections candidates sympathetic to the interests and causes of labour and to oppose its enemies regardless of their party affiliations. There were, however, occasional departures from this principle by units of the A. F. of L. and in 1904 Samuel Gompers, exasperated by the anti-labour attitude of most of the Republican leaders, campaigned for W. J. Bryan, the Democratic candidate for the Presidency, and in subsequent elections up to 1924 continued to give benevolent, although less active, support to the Democratic party. But in that year dissatisfaction with its reactionary programme made him persuade the executive of the A. F. of L. to endorse along with the Railway Brotherhoods the new Progressive party, which Senator La Follette of Wisconsin had organised. But when this venture in insurgency against the domination of the two historic parties failed, the A. F. and L. under the leadership of Mr William Green, the cautious conservative who succeeded Mr Gompers in the Presidency and still holds it, relapsed into its old position of political neutrality.

The more radical C.I.O. favoured militant political action and in the election of 1936 a number of its affiliated unions combined to establish a Labour Non-Partisan League, which under this disguise played a considerable part in the re-election of President Roosevelt and a Democratic majority in both houses of Congress. Then in 1940 a number of C.I.O. unions in the state of New York made a new forward move by organising the American Labour party, which has acquired a substantial membership in that state, but has made little headway outside it owing to internal dissensions resulting from the efforts of Communist elements to gain control of its policies.

All the administrations of President Roosevelt were friendly to labour, but during his third term of office a group of reactionary southern Democrats combined with the Republicans to block further reforms for the benefit of labour and the attitude of this alliance, combined with the aggressive hostility of many influential papers, to the demands of labour aroused the leaders of the C.I.O. to the need for better defensive measures to ensure the continuance of the Rooseveltian policies in both the domestic and international spheres. So the C.I.O. established a Political Action Committee, which, cooperating with the

Democratic machine, did very effective work in getting the workers registered in 1944 and brought to the polls and made a valuable contribution to Roosevelt's fourth victory. In that election the C.I.O. endorsed very few candidates who did not belong to the Democratic party, and after the battle was over, although it reaffirmed the traditional non-partisan policy of organised labour, it decided to keep its Political Action Committee in active operation. The A. F. of L. had also organized a similar committee but, while the great majority of its adherents voted for Roosevelt, a solid front on the Democratic side was prevented by the partiality of the leaders of certain important unions for the Republican party.

The death of Franklin Roosevelt was an unfortunate event for the American labour movement, as it removed their most effective champion and, after the weakened Democratic party was badly defeated in the Congressional election of 1946, the victorious Republicans proceeded with the help of conservative Democrats to pass in June 1947 a Labour-Management Relations Act, popularly styled the Taft-Hartley Act after its two chief sponsors, whose avowed object was to curtail the powers of the labour unions. The number and elaborate nature of its provisions forbid any detailed summary of them, but there is general agreement that they are heavily weighted in favour of the employers and impose numerous fetters upon the activities of the unions.

Drastic amendments of the National Labour Relations Act prescribe a list of important exemptions from its coverage and enlarge substantially the number of labour practices classified as unfair. In the case of an actual or threatened strike or lockout affecting a whole industry or part of an industry which would imperil national health or security, the President is empowered to appoint a board of investigation and on the strength of its report is authorised to direct the Attorney-General to move in a Federal court for relief by injunction; if the court finds that the threatened strike or lockout will endanger the nation's health or security, then it can grant an injunction against it without regard to the provisions of the Norris-La Guardia Act, which bans such injunctions. Labour organisations are forbidden to engage in activities like boycotts, sympathetic strikes or jurisdictional strikes, and

any persons or corporations injured in business or property by such activities have a right to sue the offending union and recover damages from it. Another section prohibits under severe penalties contributions either by corporations or labour organisations to expenditures in connection not only with Federal and state elections but with primary elections and party conventions. Unions are henceforth required to file financial statements annually with the Government and their officials must swear affidavits that they have no relations or sympathy with the Communist party, while it is made unlawful for any Federal employee to participate in any kind of strike. There is also a provision which seeks to forbid unions from using their own publications, now numerous, to express views upon political issues and candidates for office. To prevent the passage of this anti-labour bill the A. F. of L., the C.I.O., and the Railway Brotherhoods applied united pressure at Washington and, when they failed to secure anything but trivial modifications of its original terms, they concerted plans to nullify its operation as far as possible. They are trying to defeat some provisions by an alteration of the practices of the unions and they have challenged in the courts the constitutional validity of others on the ground that they infringe basic rights. So far the Supreme Court of the United States has upheld the requirements about financial statements and the affidavits about Communism, but it has pronounced against the projected ban upon the discussion of political issues in labour organs.

The feeling that labour had overplayed its hand during the Roosevelt regime was so strong among the farmers and the middle classes in the urban communities that, while many of the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act were regarded as too severe, its general purpose secured their approval and, since this sentiment has led to the adoption of labour codes modelled on the Taft-Hartley plan in thirty-two out of the forty-eight states, the unions are to-day on the defensive and feel that the legislative scales are tilted heavily against them. The spectacular victory achieved by the miners under the aggressive leadership of Mr Lewis has been more than offset by a series of defeats in strikes suffered by other unions. In the southern states these reverses have been so numerous and so crushing

that not only has the campaign of the C.I.O. for unionising industries in that region achieved only meagre success, but the membership of the existing unions in the South has declined so much that to-day only about one-fifth of the southern workers are organised in unions. So, apart from Mr Lewis' miners, the labour unions of the United States are at the moment licking their wounds and pondering how they can prevent the employers from consolidating their recent gains with the help of the Republican administration, which they foresee as virtually certain to be installed at Washington next year under the leadership of Governor Dewey.

Divided opinions in the high command of the unions now rule out the possibility of the united labour front for the coming election, which was threatened at the time of the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act. A few leaders of A. F. of L. unions like Mr Hutcheson, the head of the Carpenters' union, will give their habitual support to the Republican party as probably will Mr Lewis, but they will find it hard to persuade many of their followers to vote for the authors of the Taft-Hartley Act. The leftist elements of the C.I.O. have thrown in their lot with the new party of Mr Wallace and will in certain sections be the solidest core of its voting strength. The moderate leaders of the C.I.O., the A. F. of L., and the Railway Brotherhoods, now that President Truman, after his renomination as the Democratic candidate for the Presidency, has committed himself to a militant strategy against the Republicans and the Democratic programme contains an explicit pledge for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act, will probably decide to condone the earlier errors and backslidings of the President and mobilise their followers to vote for the Democratic party. And political observers assert that the successful spadework accomplished in getting the workers and their dependents registered to vote promises in the industrialised states a record labour vote, of which only a fraction will be cast for Republican candidates.

Undoubtedly the result of the approaching election will be a determining factor in the future policies of the American labour movement. If the Democratic party is, as the result of the widespread defection of southern malcontents and the secession of a mass of Leftist voters,

who supported Roosevelt, to Mr Wallace's party, badly defeated and reduced to the status of a feeble minority party, and, if Governor Dewey and his running-mate, Governor Warren of California, who have both liberal records for their attitude to labour, cannot hold in check reactionary forces in the Republican party, who are intent upon further crusades for the suppression of the labour unions, then there is distinct possibility that the organised workers of the United States will forswear their internal feuds, solidify their ranks, and proceed to build a nationwide Labour party on the British model.

To-day the workers of the United States enjoy scales of wages and standards of living which are the envy of their brethren in all other countries, but millions of them are hard pressed by the inordinately high cost of living and are convinced that they do not get their fair share of the abounding national prosperity. In a recent article published in the 'Atlantic Monthly' Mr Philip Murray, the President of the C.I.O., cited data compiled by the U.S. Bureau of Labour Statistics to show that the current average earnings of American workers, placed at \$2,730 per annum, fell substantially short of meeting the expenses of a family budget 'for a modest but adequate American standard of living' which called for an average annual income of \$3,450. He also quoted other statistics issued by the same Bureau to prove that between January 1945 and January 1948, while the profits of the corporations after provision for taxes rose 90 per cent., the average weekly wage in manufacturing industries rose only 11 per cent. and the cost of living increased 31.4 per cent. But the spokesmen of industry and business meet this charge of exorbitant profits by quoting figures to show that in 1947 all forms of income from property (profits, interest, and rents) were only one-sixth of the aggregate national income as compared with over one-fourth in 1880 and about one-fifth in 1929, and they argue that the corporations can justify a scale of high profits, because they have allocated a large portion of them to the expansion and modernisation of their plants and equipment and have thereby maintained to the benefit of the workers the efficiency of American industry and business. But the great majority of the workers do not accept this defence and contend that the distribution of the national income

is steadily becoming more unbalanced and that militant action is essential for its readjustment on an equitable basis.

They could of course follow the example of the workers of Europe and embrace the creeds of either Socialism or Communism. Since the days of the famous experiment of Brook Farm, Socialism has had its American devotees, but the organised party, which has been advocating it for more than fifty years, has had a disappointing history. Forty years ago it promised to become quite a formidable party and in the Presidential election of 1912 its candidate, Mr Eugene Debs, polled over 900,000 votes. But in the years since elapsed its strength has declined steadily and in 1944 only some 80,000 votes were cast for Mr Norman Thomas, a very able and attractive politician, who has been its candidate in every Presidential election since 1928 and has been renominated this year. Socialism retains a considerable following in odd pockets like the city of Milwaukee, which recently elected a Socialist Mayor, but in many states its only adherents are a few intellectuals and the workers have shown a persistent reluctance to favour it.

Nor have they shown any greater enthusiasm for the American Communist party, which came into existence in 1919 as a by-product of the Russian Revolution. A few years later it professed to have between 35,000 and 40,000 members, but by 1927 it could only show 8,000 registered members, of whom more than four-fifths were of immigrant origin. Its strength has risen in recent years and, according to Messrs. O'Neal and Warner, the authors of a book called 'American Communism,' its leaders now claim to have 100,000 faithful followers, who include some important figures in the labour unions. But so subservient has it been to the dictates of Moscow that it is regarded as a foreign legion of the Russian Bolshevik party rather than a genuine political party, and the widespread unpopularity, which its overlords in Moscow have generated for themselves with the American people, makes it an unsequential factor in American politics. It will, to the embarrassment of Mr. Wallace, support him next November.

But if the 16,500,000 organised workers of the United States elect to range themselves behind one political party, their decision will have as important consequences

as the similar move of the British trades unions, which enabled the British Labour Party to challenge successfully the domination of the two older British parties. The programme of such an American party would probably at first appear very moderate by comparison with those of the Labour parties of Britain, Australia, and New Zealand, because it could not afford to advocate wholesale departures from the traditions of rugged individualism, which retain such strength in North America, and it would propose as a start only modest instalments of Socialism.

But while the workers of the United States may be exasperated by their recent reverses and desire a wide variety of social and economic reforms, evidence of the absence of any revolutionary temper among them was provided by an interesting survey of the mental climate of the American people which the magazine 'Fortune' published in January 1947. The picture offered of the outlook of the American nation was evolved from replies by a cross-section of the population to a series of questions, and they revealed that the great majority of the male inhabitants of the United States were convinced that their country was still a land of opportunity and were staunch individualists who believed in the system of free enterprise.

If, however, the debacle which Moscow has been predicting for the great stronghold of capitalism befell, and a repetition of the calamitous slump which began in 1929 produced again widespread unemployment and lowered wages and standards of living, then it might become possible to organise the workers of the United States and their sympathisers among other classes for a frontal assault upon capitalism with its extermination as their goal. And in view of the tradition of violence and bloodshed which runs through the history of industrial disputes in the United States, it might well be a fortunate development if the discontent of the workers with the operations of capitalism were canalised into peaceable political activity in support of a Labour party.

JOHN A. STEVENSON.

SOME RECENT BOOKS.

- William Temple, Archbishop of Canterbury.** Dr F. A. Iremonger.
The English Language: Its Beauty and Use.
 Eton Medley. B. J. W. Hill.
The British Empire. Hector Bolitho.
The Plantagenets. John Harvey.
Essays in Philosophy. Professor A. D. Ritchie.
The British Achievement in India. H. G. Rawlinson.
The Sahibs. Hilton Brown.
The Railways of Britain. O. S. Nock.
The Netherlands. Sacheverell Sitwell.
In the Path of Mahatma Gandhi. Dr George Catlin.
- Artist in Unknown India.** Marguerite Milward.
London Marches On. Harold P. Clunn.
London Lives On. R. G. Burnett.
Words at War: Words at Peace. Eric Partridge.
Chronicles of the Hedges. Richard Jefferies. Edited by Samuel Looker.
The Jefferies Companion. Edited by Samuel Looker.
English Rivers. John Rodgers.
Charles Roden Buxton. Victoria de Bunsen.
The Same Sky Over All. David Smith.
Drawings by European Masters from the Albertine.

'William Temple, Archbishop of Canterbury,' by Dr F. A. Iremonger, Dean of Lichfield (Oxford University Press), is an outstanding work of great interest and lasting historical value. Temple attracted so much limelight during his life and so much praise (mixed with not a little strong criticism) that most readers will approach this book with opinions or prejudices already formed—not a few of them will be reformed after reading. It can hardly be denied that Temple was a great man and a great leader. Whether he was always wise in his incursions into economics and secular social problems remains undecided. He was a professed Socialist. How far this was the result of his 'palatial' background is a matter for discussion. He was born in the Palace at Exeter and till his twenty-second year Fulham and Lambeth were his family homes. From his fortieth year till his death his homes were Bishops court, Manchester, Bishopthorpe, York, and Lambeth. With such a background, with his immense abilities, and with the certainty of his religious beliefs, his path in the Church was sure to go ever upward—as it did.

In old days an archbishopric was, with some exaggeration, considered an example of *otium cum dignitate*. It certainly is not so now. Temple had very little *otium* and his *dignitas* was perhaps not as marked as that of his immediate predecessor, Cosmo Lang, in whom were combined to a most notable degree realisation of the historical

position and prelatical grandeur of the Primacy with austerity of personal life and devotion to the highest ideals.

The Rugby schoolboy, the Balliol scholar, the Fellow of Queen's, the Head Master of Repton, the rector of St James's, Piccadilly, the Canon of Westminster, the Bishop of Manchester, and the Archbishop of York and then of Canterbury form a suitable sequence in a highly distinguished career—a sequence adorned by much excellent work for the Workers' Educational Association, the Life and Liberty and Faith and Order Movements, Copec, the Œcumenical Movement and World Council of Churches, the Student Christian Movement and many other similar activities.

The three episcopal duties of administrator, pastor, and teacher were always before his eyes, and if many may regret his incursions into what seemed like party politics (though he would have denied the 'party') and commercial economics, much may be forgiven to a man of such vigour, vitality (even exuberance), joyousness, friendliness, and faith. He fully deserves a tribute written by a well-known writer—' Temple had a unique place in national life. His faith, his fearlessness, his learning, his many-sidedness, the depth of his sympathy, his humour, his integrity, and his intellectual capacity distinguished him from all other men in the life not only of the Anglican Church, or churches as a whole, but of the nation.'

Dr. Iremonger had a great subject which would have daunted many writers, but with his skill, balance, discernment, and sympathy he has achieved a really fine work.

In 'The English Language: Its Beauty and its Use,' Messrs. Odham's have produced a very useful and readable handbook, planned to assist the reader to a general appreciation of literature. Each chapter deals with one aspect of the subject, and without entering controversy and confusing detail explains what to look for and how to understand it. Thus we have chapters on English Prose, the Novel, the Short Story, Essays, Poetry, History, Drama, Biography, Memoir, and Criticism. Finally, we are given an excellent short survey of how our language has grown and how to use it, with some rules of grammar, proper use of words and phrases, and correct punctuation, all subjects of which many readers and writers are lamentably ignorant. The book will act as a good guide for

those who want to read the best books, but do not know where to find them. It is also a guide to those to want to read primarily for pleasure. The unnamed contributors are usefully instructive as, among many instances, on the special characteristics of eighteenth-century literature. They can also be trenchant, as for instance 'What was the matter with the Victorians? The matter was that they were inflated. Material prosperity bloated them out to a florid complacency. The stuffing was cant, moralising, poetical bombast, sentimentality—they crammed all this into their poetry.' Is this quite fair? At any rate it makes entertaining reading and is thought-provoking.

In our last number an old Etonian reviewer had the pleasure of paying a tribute to Dr Laborde's book and its subject, Harrow School. It is now a still greater pleasure to the same reviewer to pay a still greater tribute to a still greater school (as he naturally thinks) described in Mr B. J. W. Hill's '*Eton Medley*' (Winchester Publications). The work is admirably planned and achieved and covers Eton's long and distinguished past history and present activities and problems with skill, lucidity, and most pleasing humour. Eton is shown through the centuries, with the coming of changes and reforms, often in former days too little and too late. Then we are given chapters on College, Oppidan houses, Tutors, schoolwork, 'crime and punishment' (really wittily described), sport, the J.T.C., other activities, festivals and Eton at war, followed by a useful glossary and bibliography. Probably one of the reader's strongest impressions will be how so varied and intensive a programme of work and play can possibly be fitted into the time available. Another impression for the non-Etonian reader will be how so many quaint and at first sight inexplicable customs dating from of old can still be successfully fitted into the present-day pattern. For old Etonians the impression will be largely nostalgic—and yet we all know that things would be very different if we were actually transported back again to those past years! Mr Hill is much to be congratulated on his work.

Mr Hector Bolitho and his author colleagues have in '*The British Empire*' (Batsford) eminently succeeded in the difficult task of making good literature and agreeable reading of what is really a composite work of reference.

Their object is to give a brief and informed survey of the countries of the British Commonwealth of Nations, India and the Colonies of the Empire, with some account of their lands, people, history, products, political (and often racial) problems and future outlook. It is often forgotten that besides the Dominions there are no less than fifty-four separate colonies with a population of 63,000,000. Many races, almost countless languages and dialects, greatly varied degrees of progress and civilisation and material prosperity are represented—though to talk of the blessings of western European civilisation after the appalling horrors committed in Europe of late years might well make the primitive native of 'Darkest Africa' jeer! We are told that 'the tone of this book is a modest one, free from jingoism, but the total effect of the contributions is one of pride for what the Empire has achieved in the spreading of a democratic way of life and the establishment of peace.' Nearly 200 well-chosen and excellently reproduced illustrations adorn the volume, and among the contributors are such well-known writers as Hector Bolitho, Sir Harry Luke, James Pope-Hennessy, Lady Southorn, Elspeth Huxley, Owen Rutter, and Kenneth Bradley. This is emphatically a book to buy and keep.

Mr John Harvey is to be congratulated on his latest book '**The Plantagenets**' (Batsford). The dynasty from Henry II to Richard III makes an interesting study of the craft of kingship, and a gallery of human portraits, greatly varying in appearance and characteristics but all alike in their conviction of their divinely ordained kingly position. Mr Harvey shows an excellent determination not to be bound by the views and conclusions of former historians, but to re-assess the kings in the light of his own study and convictions. So Edward II and Richard II get more appreciation and sympathy than is usually accorded to them. 'The life of Plantagenet England falls conveniently into three sections or seasons: spring, ushered in by Henry II and brought into full bud by Henry III; the blossom time of summer initiated under Edward I and completed by the blazing glory of Richard II; and the chilly autumn, lasting from Henry IV to Richard III and broken by the little Italian summer of revived culture at the court of Henry VI and his polished uncles. The two great turning points are the reigns of Edward I and of

Richard II.' These words of the author are the key to the whole skilful and very readable book, while the illustrations are of historical value and striking interest.

Professor A. D. Ritchie need make no apology for collecting and republishing his '**Essays in Philosophy**' (Longmans) in book form. They are occasional garnerings from a notable life work and, unless the man in the street acquires and exercises a worthwhile philosophy, and that soon, he, and all he has made, will perish in the brutishness from which it so long ago emerged. Perhaps the papers on 'Errors of Logical Positivism,' 'The Atomic Theory as Metaphysics and as Science,' and even 'Theories of Immortality' are too tough for the mentally spoonfed, but an intelligent schoolboy could read and enjoy, and even a debauched film fan or sports maniac benefit by absorbing such clear and vivid studies as 'Freedom: Can Common-sense be Trusted?' 'The Ethics of Pacifism,' and 'The Logic of Question and Answer.' Believers in luck, gambling, and sudden riches from Football Pools should surely find the essay on 'Miracles' easily convincing, while that delightful example of debunking humbug entitled 'Magic in Modern Politics' should be made a subject of compulsory study in every schoolroom, university, newspaper office, and political association throughout this uncivilised world. The account of Isaac Newton is a refreshing glimpse of true English greatness in all its human heights and human limitations. Some of Professor Ritchie's readers will be glad that such an acknowledged authority should remind us that one of the great British philosophers, Samuel Alexander, has not yet been granted his full stature. As an apostle of the cardinal axiom that Truth, Goodness, and Beauty are puissant, if not absolute, Alexander has, in modern times, not been surpassed.

In these days when Britain's rule in India seems to have ended in disruption and sometimes in obloquy, a book like '**The British Achievement in India**,' by H. G. Rawlinson (William Hodge), is comforting. It gives a well-balanced and informative account of what actually was done. We cannot but agree with Lord Curzon's characteristic pronouncement 'To me the message is carved in granite, it is hewn out of the rock of doom—that our work is righteous and that it shall endure' or again 'Let those who wish to see what the British Government is capable

of doing in India go there, not in prosperous times, but when the country is in the throes of a great famine. They would then see what no government in the world, except our own, is capable of undertaking now; and what I firmly believe that no government, European or Indian, by which we might conceivably be succeeded, would dream of undertaking in the future.' Mr Rawlinson considers that want of imagination was where we failed. 'It was inevitable that India, as she acquired a national consciousness under the unifying influence of British rule, and absorbed British political ideas, should demand, with ever increasing insistence, the right to be mistress in her own house. We were reluctant to realise this fact, and the concessions when they were made were too little and too late.' Of material benefits which we gave to India the tale is immense. The ungrudging, high-minded service given, generation after generation, not only by those with names known to fame but by hundreds of the rank and file whose noble work lies buried in oblivion, makes an inspiring story, and we hope that when the present dust of turmoil has subsided, it will not lack appreciation, even among Indian leaders. It is a pity that so good a book was not given the careful proof-reading which it deserves—hence too many errors.

We are told that 'The Sahibs,' by Hilton Brown (William Hodge), is 'a faithful mirror of that great class, the Sahibs, throughout the years. The reader will laugh at them, pity them, condemn them, but he will also admire them.' Certainly Mr Hilton Brown gives us a most entertaining and instructive anthology culled from letters, diaries, books, and other records, but we could wish that he had done more to enforce the 'admire and respect' point of view. If many of these extracts, showing the habits and behaviour of the British in India, were at all typical, we can only be surprised that the Indians did not make much greater efforts much earlier to be finally quit of us! To get a really fair picture more should be given to show the great benefits that India has received and to recall the great names so justly venerated in India such as Lawrence, Nicholson, Outram, Roberts, Jacob, Skinner and countless others. Certainly the British in India had to endure much from climate, pests, separation of families, sickness, and administrative difficulties,

and tempers were often sorely tried—too much tried for many—but that is only one side and there was much that was splendidly altruistic and Mr Brown's entertaining book hardly shows this sufficiently.

Probably most normal-minded boys are at some time 'railwayacs,' stored with an immense amount of varied information about engines, rolling stock, and other railway ingredients. Many, not unhappily for themselves, remain 'railwayacs' always, and to them Mr O. S. Nock's **'The Railways of Britain'** (Batsford) will bring much pleasure as well as information. There is much that is nostalgic for older readers who, however much they may admire the dignified and attractive appearance of, say, the streamlined 'Sir Nigel Gresley' type of L.N.E.R. engine, yet regret the many varieties of colour and design in the days when independent railways were numbered by the dozen and each had its own colour scheme, as for instance the deep blue of the Caledonian, the vivid green of the North Eastern, and the bright yellow of the L.B. & S.C.R. associated with holiday visits to the seaside. Mr Nock writes with wide experience and enthusiasm and deals first with the Railway Heritage and the birth and growth of the various lines. Then he deals with motive power, engines, carriages, and wagons, control of traffic, and the Railway Clearing House. Then he gives a review over 100 years and ends with a most entertaining chapter 'A Miscellany of Oddities, Anecdotes, and Fiction.' There are well over a hundred well-chosen and excellently produced illustrations.

Mr Sacheverell Sitwell is an agreeable and instructive guide. In his latest book **'The Netherlands'** (Batsford) he takes us through that attractive and individual country which by no means consists only of famous towns, picture galleries, windmills, canals, and rather bare churches. 'Now for the true Holland,' he writes. 'For it is something more than the trams and bicycles of Amsterdam. We want to see the dykes and polders, the fishermen in baggy trousers, and the old harbours on the Zuyder Zee. Briefly we would have what is as typical of Holland as the bull fight is of Spain.' But Mr Sitwell gives us more than that, as his interest in and knowledge of architecture and craftsmanship are great and he has discovered much to his taste in out-of-the-way places in Holland. His chapter

on the work of Daniel Marot is specially interesting, and so is the one on Dutch gardens. Friesland is little known except by name and most readers will be surprised to find what an unusual, attractive, and unspoilt province it is. Naturally in a book like this there must be references to great works of art in a country which begot Rembrandt, Frans Hals and many others known to fame, but Mr Sitwell does not stress this point of view: it is the soul of Holland and its people, so to speak, which have captivated him and which he passes on to his readers. The very numerous well-chosen and excellently reproduced illustrations are an added attraction.

Dr George Catlin's lifelong interest in the cause of World Peace led to a recent pilgrimage to India, and the writing of '**In the Path of Mahatma Gandhi**' (Macdonald). In spite of the absence of any marked felicity of style, and evidence of hurry in the organisation and writing of the book, the twofold task was worth while. Although since his martyrdom Gandhi's stock has unaccountably fallen, even in India, he was, and will remain, a significant world figure. Dr Catlin's Odyssey from Nuremberg eastward to China via Delhi in the north and Bangalore in the south enables him to give his readers up-to-date cinema-like glimpses of Christians, Hindus, Moslems, Sikhs, and Untouchables; it does not, however, provide him with opportunities of uncovering the depth and complexities of the problems of International Peace, or perhaps even set them in a perspective that ordinary readers might grasp. Myriad-minded India is indeed a tangled forest of conflicting thought to the average European and it, for example, little helps that the author, instead of adopting a single one of Gandhi's many appellations at the outset and sticking to it, refers to him on a single page as Gandhi, Mahatma Gandhi, M. K. Gandhi, and Mohandas Gandhi! As a Doctor of Philosophy and a scholar the author can doubtless think in several languages, but to the layman it is confusing when, following St Paul, he sometimes uses the word charity as a synonym for love, sometimes as righteousness in one or other of its many implications, and sometimes as mere almsgiving. Such evidences of haste to make the most of a passing wave of intense popular emotion vitiate what might otherwise have been a book of lasting value.

'Artist in Unknown India,' by Marguerite Milward (Werner Laurie) with a brief introduction by Professor H. J. Fleure, a Past-President of the Royal Anthropological Institute, is one of those disappointing books that could easily have been much better than it is. Mrs Milward is well known for her portrait busts of English people, has a genuine love for India and an intuitive understanding of its more primitive types; her sculptured heads of typically striking men and women of many different tribes are really remarkable—but her writing is inadequate. It is over twenty years since she paid her first visit to India and of her courage, patience, and enthusiasm there can be no question. Her anthropological knowledge is sketchy and, as a general guide to India, she is ordinary. Her publishers have been generous: nearly a hundred illustrations from drawings and photographs by the sculptress are in fact the main interest and value of the book, the twenty-eight reproductions of her sculptured heads from the Bombay Presidency, Deccan, Assam, and Nepal being alone worth the price of the book. In fact if Mrs Milward had given us these, and the thirty-eight of her bronzes purchased by the Government of India for the Indian Museum in Calcutta, we would have foregone most of the other illustrations—but not the line drawing of the enchanting frieze of Ducks from a cave in Badami. Mrs Milward's prose is bewildering: what are we to make of the king who excavated a temple 'and also founded a village to maintain the worship in his beautiful home of stone' or 'second class babies' for babies travelling second class? Some Indian words wear Roman dress, some italics, and others inverted commas. Sights are uncanny, weird, colourful, amazing, and tremendous. The Index is feeble, and it is difficult to understand why such familiar words as avatar, banyan, Begum, backsheesh, Brahma, Buddha, ghat, lapis lazuli, lotus, paddy, purdah, and sari should be included in the glossary.

If the title of Recorder of London were not already attached to a high legal office it might well be bestowed on Mr Harold P. Clunn for his series of books dealing with the ever-changing London, district by district and often street by street. His latest work is 'London Marches On' (The Caen Press) and its aim is to show the changes that have taken place in central London since the First World

War and the amazing expansion of the outer metropolitan area—the rapid growth of Cobbett's 'Great Wen' and the consequent loss of much attractive countryside. However, Mr Clunn's purpose is not to discuss the pros and cons of London's rebuilding and expansion, but to show what actually has been done, how countless houses have been superseded by vast blocks of flats, how streets have been widened and largely rebuilt, changing their whole character, how housing estates have been laid out, and how houses have been made for London's teeming population as well as stately (or otherwise) buildings erected for purposes of commerce, education, or recreation. Mr Clunn's courage in undertaking such a survey alone is great and his patient industry still greater and he is to be congratulated on both.

With Mr Clunn's book it is suitable to refer to '**London Lives On**' with text by R. G. Burnett and photographs by E. W. Tattersall (Phoenix House). When so much of what we used to know in London has been destroyed, it is pleasing to find so well chosen, well described, and well illustrated a record of much that remains. London is divided into five sections with twelve to twenty-five full page plates in each, ranging, for instance, from Buckingham Palace to the Pagoda at Kew Gardens, from 10, Downing Street to the Zoo, from Lambeth Palace to 'The Old Vic,' or from the British Museum to the Albert Memorial. With each photograph is a descriptive page of text giving the relevant information in concise form. Londoners will enjoy having this book on their shelves to browse on at any time.

We are told of Mr Eric Partridge's '**Words at War: Words at Peace**' (Muller) that it is 'written with that combination of alertness and scholarship, wit and wide interests, which characterises his work upon language.' That is a fair appraisal but the whole is a bit of a hotch-potch, agreeable enough but the ingredients of which are of mixed value. It might possibly have been better to weld the whole into a unified whole rather than leave the contributions exactly as they were originally issued—from an article in the 'Quarterly' to the text of a Christmas card. The initial contribution on 'Gatherations' is very entertaining and the articles or words with which war has enriched (or otherwise) the language is of permanent value.

Some of the other articles are of lesser value, but Mr Partridge on his own special subject is always well worth reading.

A new book by Richard Jefferies is a welcome event and **'Chronicles of the Hedges'** (Phoenix House) will find many friends. In addition to his well-known published works, Jefferies left many articles, some published in magazines between 1877 and 1887 and some never published at all, which doubtless he would have used for further volumes but for his lingering illness and all too early death. Mr Samuel Looker, whose unquenchable ardour and persistent search have discovered so much of Jefferies' work and made it available to readers, has added to the debt which we owe him by compiling and editing this latest volume. It is, of course, a bit of a hotch-potch and contains about fifty essays of varying length, besides numerous short notes. All are not of equal value, but how good the best is! Many of the essays will arouse nostalgic longings for the countryside in the minds of readers tied to the towns. We are shown the country at all times of the year and under many conditions. In the hands of a master it needs but little to provide absorbing interest—for instance in the essay **'The Meadow Gateway'** we are confined to one gap in the hedge between two fields, and yet when we learn of all the plant, animal, bird, beast, and insect life that marks that small space we are absorbed in the wonders of nature. This is the kind of book to have by one and open and read at any place at any time with delight.

The many admirers of Jefferies work will also find pleasure in **'The Jefferies Companion'** which, like the above volume, has been arranged and introduced by Mr Looker and published by Phoenix House. It contains a comprehensive selection of Jefferies' work including **'The Gamekeeper at Home,' 'Wild Life in a Southern County,'** and similar natural history books, and of his novels Mr Looker also contributes a concise biography and bibliography. It is a book to step into anywhere at any time with pleasure.

'English Rivers,' by John Rodgers (Batsford), is a most refreshing book, taking the reader, jaded and weary with much study of many books about present-day national and international affairs, into the realms of happy

memory of rushing moorland brooks, or wide and gentle streams between meadow and cornfield, or of past happy days in boat or canoe, or in waders or angling for the elusive trout. It is sadly true that many of our finest rivers are now defiled and degraded by industrialism and its attendant dirt and pollution, but Mr Rodgers does not dwell unduly on these. North, south, east, and west, he takes us travelling along the rivers, capturing our interest and exciting our curiosity. Take the west only: Axe, Otter, Clist, Culne, Exe, Teign, Dart, Avon, Erme, Yealm, Plym, Tavy, Tamar, Lyd, Fowey, Fal, Helford, Camel, Torridge, Okement, Taw, Tone, Yeo, Parrett, Cary, and Brue. There is real enchantment in many of the names—and how many readers will have to confess that they have never heard of not a few of them? Mr Rodgers begins boldly with 'No other country has such a number and variety of rivers as England. We may not have anything to compare in size with the Amazon or Mississippi, but practically every mile or so of country is criss-crossed by ditches, streams, brooks, and rivers.' This attractive book is adorned by over 160 excellent illustrations.

We are told of '**Charles Roden Buxton**,' by Victoria de Bunsen (Allen and Unwin), that it is 'a memoir of a man who, nurtured in conditions of security and spaciousness, sought to eliminate from his life all the clogging impediments and trappings of wealth, and to retain only that measure of material sufficiency which directly contributed to his powers of service.' Early in life he inclined to an academic career in Cambridge or elsewhere, but circumstances drove him into a larger sphere of work, and politics and social service absorbed him—both carried out with high ideals and with no personal ambition for power or fame. He never became a 'successful politician' and 'he never aspired to be one. His ambition was impersonal because his religion was its motive; he set out to attain an end that was not self regarding at all—to help his fellow workers in various political causes to take the successive practical steps towards this or that particular object, and to advance the cause of what may be called political education.' From inherited Church of England Evangelicalism and political Liberalism he gradually passed over to Quakerism and Labour party socialism. He was an untiring worker for international friendship—

including Germany, and he always had the moral courage to support unpopular causes if he thought them right. We may disagree with his political views and even consider the austerity of his personal life somewhat overdone, but we must admire a man of such high character who pursued his ideals so unflinchingly.

'The Same Sky Over All,' by David Smith (Dent), is attractively redolent of the countryside. He is (as his forebears were) a practical, keen, and skilled farmer, but he also has the advantage of a gift of literary expression and of conveying rustic speech and thought in a vivid way. The countryside of which he tells is Essex, and whether he is writing about the farm buildings, the fields, the threshing 'gang,' the stackyard, the plough, sowing, reaping, manure mixing, pea picking or any other farm activity, much is put down in the form of conversations with the countrymen concerned, with many characteristic touches and stories, sometimes in very natural outspoken vein. There is nothing very technical or deep about the book, but as a means of getting a whiff of the real countryside in a town armchair it will bring some pleasurable hours.

The exhibition at the Victoria and Albert Museum last year of drawings from the Albertine Collection in Vienna was so deservedly popular that many will welcome Messrs Batsford's very finely produced volume '**Drawings by European Masters from the Albertine,**' with an introduction and explanatory notes by Walter Uberwasser and nineteen facsimile colour plates and nine illustrations in the text. The bare list of names of artists included is more effective than any review—Botticelli, Raphael, Michelangelo, Correggio, Dürer, Clouet, Brueghel, Lancret, Watteau, Titian, Guardi, Ruysdael, Van der Neer, and Claude Lorrain. Short notes on these drawings and on the Albertine Collection adequately fulfil their purpose, but it is the notable reproductions which will give real delight—the only complaint being that there is not enough of them and that some favourites have been omitted.

INDEX

TO THE

TWO HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-SIXTH VOLUME OF THE QUARTERLY REVIEW.

[Titles of Articles are printed in heavier type. The names of authors of articles are printed in italics.]

A.

Abercrombie, Sir Patrick, 501.
Ackers, C. P., 384.
Acton, Lord, 468.
Accart, Col., 'Bataille dans le Ciel Russe,' 527.
Adams, Quincy, 'Life of Shakespeare,' 291.
Ade, George, 190.
Agnew, Joan (afterwards Mrs Arthur Severn), 208, 213, 216.
Ainsworth, Harrison, 264.
Alba, Duke of Berwick and, 28, 315, 321.
Albornoz, Sr Alvaro, 33.
Alexander II, Emperor of Russia, 5.
Alfonso XIII, King, 321.
Allen, Cecil J., 231-232.
Ambedkar, Dr, 471.
American Labour Front, The, 531-546.
American and Russian Air Power, 523-530.
Amery, Rt Hon. L. S., 'Thoughts on the Constitution,' 136.
Amel, Joseph, 13-14, 16-19.
Anatomy of Communalism, 445-454.
Anderson, Colin S., 325.
Andreyevich, Victor, 16.
Angell, Sir Norman, 'The Steep Places,' 338.
Army Experiment in Further Education, The, 192-203.
Arnall, Ellis, 403.
Arruga, Dr, 324.
Asquith, H. H. (Earl of Oxford and Asquith), 75, 247.
Atkinson, Thomas Dinham, 'Local Style in English Architecture,' 414-415.
Attlee, Rt Hon. Clement, 133, 308.
Austen, Jane, 264, 267.
Australia and the Aborigines, 512-522.

B.

Baden-Powell, 1st Lord, 503-508.
Baldwin, Rt Hon. Stanley, afterwards 1st Earl, 430, 435, 438, 443.
Balfour, A. J. (1st Earl of Balfour), 292 and Note, 'Science, Religion and Reality.'
Ballinger, Mrs, 170.
Barnes, Thomas, 244, 246.
Barton, Sir William, 'India and the Middle East,' 37-43; 'A Year of Independence in India and Pakistan,' 469-484.
Barrio, Sr, 32.

Bates, Mrs Daisy, 514; 'The Passing of the Aborigines,' 515.
Baykov, Dr, 'The Development of the Soviet Economic System,' 526.
Beazley, Sir Raymond, 'Hungary, Formerly, Yesterday, To-Day,' 399-397.
Bedwell, C. E. A., 'The Health of the Family,' 56-69.
Bee, Edgar, 'New Deal for Australian Aborigines,' 520.
Beloff, Max, 'The Foreign Policy of Soviet Russia,' 4.
Bell, Charles Frederick Moberly, 242-244, 246.
Belloc, Hilaire, 70.
Benes, President, 440.
Bennett, Mr Justice, 67.
Bennett, Viscount, 116.
Bensusan, S. L., 'These from God's Country,' 143.
Benwich, Professor Norman, 'Ethiopia among the United Nations, 495-502.
Berrey, Lester V., 181.
Betjeman, John, 338 and Note.
Beveridge, Lord, 'India called Them,' 415.
Bevin, Rt Hon. Ernest, 134, 319, 444, 497.
Birmingham, Bishop of, Dr Barnes 'The Rise of Christianity,' 285, 290-295, 297.
Birth of Unoforce, The, 93-99.
Black, Alexander, 180, 183.
Blake, William, 249.
Blanc, Louis, 326.
Blum, M., 451, 453.
Bluntschli, J. G., 96-97, 99.
Bolitho, Hector, 'The British Empire,' 549-550.
Bordon, Sir Robert, 115.
Boswell, James, 262.
Books, Some Recent, 135-144, 273-284, 412-424, 547-559.
Bourchier, James David, 243.
Bourgeois, Leon, 98-99.
Bourgeois, M., 155.
Bracey, Axel, 191.
Bracken, John, 117.
Braham, D. D., 243.
Briggs, Martin S., 'Men of Taste,' 138-140.
Brindle, Father, 143.
British Railways Past and Present, 228-241.
Brown, Ford Madox, 251, 255.
Brown, Hilton, 'The Sahibs,' 552.
Brown, Dr John, 268, 207, 210, 468.
Brown, Rawdon, 468.

Brown, W. F., 182.
 Browning, Elizabeth Barrett, 266, 468.
 Bryan, W. J., 540.
 Bryant, Arthur, 'English Saga,' 866.
 Bunbury, Isle, 'Australia and the Aborigines,' 512-522.
 Bunyan, John, 257.
 Burnett, R. G., 'London Lives On,' 556.
 Butler, Dr Nicholas Murray, 308.
 Butler, Lt-Col P. R., 'They also Served,' 100-112.
 Butler, Sir Harold, 'Peace or Power,' 273-274.
 Burne-Jones, Sir Edward, 255.
 Burns, Dr Cecil Delisle, 'The First Europe,' 283-284.
 Burrows, Frederick, 331, Note.

C.

Cadogan, Hon. Sir Anthony, 431, 442.
 Calpin, G. H., 'There are no South Africans,' 162, Note.
 Canalejas, Sr Jose, 75.
 Carlyle, Thomas, 216.
 Carter, Charles, 'The Pre-Raphaelites as Religious Painters,' 248-261.
 Castle, Don, 184.
 Cassells, Mr Justice, 64.
 Catlin, Dr George, 'In the Path of Mahatma Gandhi,' 554.
 Cecil, Lord, 425.
 Chamberlain, Rt Hon. Sir Austen, 426, 430, 432, Note, 434, 443.
 Chamberlain, Rt Hon. Neville, 429, 433, 438, 440-443.
 Chetty, Sanmukhan, 471.
 Chiang-Kai-Shek, General, 39.
 Chinnery, E. W. P., 520, 521.
 Chirol, Sir Valentine, 243.
 Christopher, Sir George, 351-352.
 Churchill, Rt Hon. Winston, 147, 227, 315, 388, 401; 'The Gathering Storm,' 425-426, 430-431, 439, 442, 443.
 Citrine, Sir Walter (now Lord), 15-16.
 Clemenceau, M., 445-446.
 Cleveland, Grover, 440.
 Clunn, Harold P., 'London Marches On,' 555-556.
 Clusius, Charles, 46.
 Cromer, Earl of, 147, 149, 151.
 Colvin, Brenda, 'Land and Landscape,' 375.
 Collinson, James, 252.
 Constable, John, 261.
 Communism in Practice, 1-20.
 Concerning English Oak and Timber, 374-387.
 Cowper, Mrs, 212.
 Credibility of the Gospel, The, 285-297.
 Creighton, Bishop, 289-290; 'Life and Letters of Mandell Creighton,' Note, 290.
 Cripps, Sir Stafford, 342.
 Curtis, Miss Myra, 66.
 Curzon, 1st Marquess, 430.

D.

Dafoe, John, 'Laurier: A Study in Canadian Politics,' 114.
 Daladier, M., 443.

Dale, Anthony, 'Fashionable Brighton, 1820-1860,' 419-420.
 Dallin, David J., 'The Real Soviet Russia,' 4.
 Darlington, W. A., 'I do what I like,' 278.
 Dawson, Geoffrey, 246, 441.
 Deane, General, 'The Strange Alliance,' 543 Note.
 de Albornoz, Sr Alvaro, 317.
 del Alvarez, Vayo, 33.
 de Blowitz H. S., 243.
 de Bourbon, Don Alfonso Carlos, 320-321.
 de Bunsen, Victoria, 'Charles Roden Buxton,' 558-559.
 Debs, Eugene, 545.
 de Courcy, John, 'Religion and Politics,' 366-373.
 de Gaulle, General, 446.
 de las Barceñas, Don Domingo, 25.
 Delane, J. T., 244, 246.
 Delcaasé, M., 153, 156-157.
 Dallin, David J., 'The Real Soviet Russia,' 526.
 de Madariaga, Don Salvador, 'The Fall of the Spanish American Empire, 275-276, 313.
 de Mata, Sr Caio, 318.
 Democracy Re-Examined, 325-339.
 Denning, Mr Justice, 57.
 de Salas, Professor, 324.
 Dewey, Governor, 405-406, 408-409.
 Dickens, Charles, 181, 264-265.
 Displaced Person: A Twentieth Century Phenomenon, The, 33-92.
 Domecque, Adèle, 205.
 Douglas, Norman, 383.
 Douglas-Boswell, Miss, 464.
 Drew, Colonel, 118.
 Duffield, H. T., 336.
 Dutton, Ralph, 'The Land of France,' 138-139.
 Don Juan, Infante, 321.
 Douglas, Mr Justice W. O., 403.

E.

Ease and Group Selfishness, 126-134.
 Eden, Rt Hon. Anthony, 426, 431, 437-438, 442, 452.
 Edgeworth, Maria, 264.
 Edlin, H. L., 385.
 Edward VII, King, 243.
 Eisenhower, General, 403-405.
 Elgin, Earl of, 165.
 Ellis, Hamilton, 'The Trains we Loved,' 233, 236.
 Eliot, T. S., 330.
 Elkin, Professor A. P., 'Citizenship for the Aborigines,' 517, 522.
 Elwin, Malcolm, 'The First Romantics,' 135-136.
 Engels, F., 327.
 Esdaile, Arundell, 'Thackeray,' 262-272.
 Essendon, Lord, 351.
 Ethiopia among the United Nations, 495-502.
 Ethiopia, Emperor of, 498-499, 500-502.
 Evans, Sir Arthur, 509.
 Evans, Frederic, 'The Army Experiment in Further Education,' 192-203.
 Even Spain, 310-324.
 Ewing, Dr A. C., 'The Individual, the State and World Government,' 137-138.

F.

- Fashoda**, 145-161.
 Feiling, Keith, 'The Life of Neville Chamberlain,' 425, 488.
 Fisher, Dr, Archbishop of Canterbury, 296.
 Fisher, H. A. L., 301.
 Fitter, R. S. R., 'London's Natural History,' 46, 48, 58.
 Flandin, M., 443.
 Flaubert, Gustave, 265.
 Flynt, Josiah, 190.
 Foch, Marshal, 445-446.
 Franco, General, 23, 25, 27-31, 312-313, 315, 318-321, 324.
 'Furber Conference on Naval Affairs, 1940,' 313, Note.
 Fuller General J. F. C., 'The Second World War,' 526.

G.

- Gandhi, Mahatma, 165, 470-471, 477.
 Garcia, Cristino, 322-323.
 Gardner, Arthur, 'Western Highlands,' 144.
 Gardner-Smith, Dr. 290.
 Geiringer, Karl, 'Hadyr,' 278-279.
 Gibbs, Lewis, 'Sheridan,' 136-137.
 Gibbs, Sir Philip, 432.
 Gide, André, 13-17, 19, 448.
 Gill, Eric, 260.
 Gillespie, Dr R. D., 486.
 Giral, Señor, 32.
 Gladstone, Rt Hon. W. E., 153, 243.
 Godden, G. M., 'Conflict in Spain,' 313, Note.
 Goebbels, Joseph, 436.
 Goering, Herman, 436.
 Goldsmith, Oliver, 49.
 Comper, Samuel, 533, 540.
 Gordon, General, of Khartoum, 147-148.
 Gozzoti, Bennozzo, 251.
 Gray, Euphemia (afterwards Lady Millais), 212, 462-464, 467-468.
 Gray, George, 464.
 Green, William, 540.
 Greene, Robert, 188.
 Gregory XVI, 71.
 Gresley, Sir Nigel, 281.
 Grey, Viscount, of Fallodon, 433-444.
 Grim, Dr, 218-220, 224.
 Grimsdick, T. R., Note, 131.
 Grimthorpe, Lord, 229.
 Guérard, Professor Albert, 'France: A Short History,' 284.
 Guitard, Louis, 447.

H.

- Hadley, W. W., 'Munich: Before and After,' 425, 443.
 Hailsham, 1st Viscount, 443.
 Hain, Sir Edward, 351.
 Halifax, Earl of, 438-439.
 Halsey, Admiral, 407.
 Hamilton, Professor Henry, 'History of the Homeland,' 274.
 Hanotiaux, M., 154.
 Hardy, Eric, 'Birds of the Liverpool Area,' 47.
 Harvey, John, 'The Plantagenets,' 550-551.
 Havenga, N. C., 176.
 Hayek, Professor, 'The Road to Serfdom,' 298.

- Hayes, Professor Carlton, 318; 'Wartime Mission in Spain,' Note, 313.
 Hayward, Abraham, 276.
Health of the Family, The, 56-60.
 Healy, Dr William, 487.
 Hegel, G. W. F., 326.
 Henderson, Rt Hon. Arthur, 432, and Note.
 Hill, Senator, 401.
 Hill, B. J. W., 'Eton Medley,' 540.
 Hitler, Adolf, 428-429, 433, 435-438, 441-443.
 Hoare, Sir Samuel (Viscount Templewood), 435.
 Holden, Lord, 'The Land of France,' 138-140.
 Hole, Christine, 'English Home Life,' 281-282.
 Horsley, Rev. J. W., 182.
 Horthy, Admiral, 389.
 Hoskins, Dr W. G., 380.
 Howard, A. L., 374.
 Hooper, Horace Everett, 244-245.
 Hudson, W. H., 48.
 Hughes, Dr Everett, 'French Canada in Transition,' 113, 120, 122.
Hungary, Formerly, Yesterday and To-Day, 388-397.
 Hunt, William Holman, 250-251, 253-257, 260-261, 271.
 Hunter, General Sir Archibald, 148.
 Hunyadi, John, 388.
 Hunyadi, Matthias, 388.
 Huxley, Aldous, 'Ends and Means,' 330.

I.

- India and the Middle East**, 37-43.
 'International Who's Who,' 423.
 Ipi, Fakir of, 482.
 Iremonger, Dr F. A., Dean of Lichfield, 'William Temple, Archbishop of Canterbury,' 547-548.
 Irwin, Godfrey, 181, 190.
 Ivatt, Mr, 230-231.

J.

- Jacks, Dr L. P., 330.
 Jackson, Dr, R. M., 487.
 James, Henry, 432.
 James, Admiral Sir William, 464; 'The Order of Release,' 467-468.
 Javier, Prince, of Bourbon Parma, 321.
 Jayakar, Dr, 480.
 Jefferies, Richard, 'Chronicles of the Hedges,' 557.
 Jefferson, Thomas, 400.
 Jespersen, Dr, 224.
 Jinnah, M. A., 482.
 Jones, Sir William, 219-220.
 Johnson, Charles, 'The Growth of Twelve Master-Pieces,' 416-417.
 Johnson, Sir Robert, 336.
 Johnson, Samuel, 262, 268.
John Ruskin's Parents, 455-468.
 Jordana, General, 315.
 Juan Infante Don, 28-30.

K.

- Kelat, Khan of, 482.
 Kempe, Andre, 220.
 Kenyon, Sir Frederic, 'The Bible and Modern Scholarship,' 285, 288, 294.

Kennedy, A. L., 'Fashoda,' 145-161; 'Munich: The Disintegration of British Statesmanship,' 425-444.

Kennedy, Sir John, Note, 159.

Kenny, Father Peter, 70-71.

Kershaw, John D., 'An Approach to Social Medicine,' 56, 58-63.

Khan, Abdul Ghafter, 482.

King, Mackenzie, 116, 534.

Kirkpatrick, Mr., 442.

Kitchener, Earl of Khartoum, 145-150, 152, 156, 158, 160-161.

Kravchenko, Andrew, 5.

Kravchenko, Victor, 'I Choose Freedom,' 8-6, 8-9, 10, 13-120.

Kropotkin, Prince Peter, 5.

L.

Laborde, Dr E. D., 'Harrow School, Yesterday and To-Day,' 421-422.

LalKania, Sir Hari, 480.

Lamb, Charles, 49.

La Follette, Senator, 540.

Lang, Dr, Cosmo Gordon, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, 547-548

Lange, Dr, 22.

Lancaster, Osbert, 'Classical Landscape,' 510.

Language of the Underworld, The, 179-191.

La Touche, Rose, 204-208, 210, 214-218, 468.

La Touche, Mrs., 204, 206, 208, 212, 216, 468.

Laurier, Sir Wilfrid, 114.

Laval, M., 435, 452.

Lavino, William, 243.

Lawrence, H. G., 169-170.

Lawrence, John, 'Life in Russia,' 1.

Lecky, W. E. H., 327-328.

Lee, Asher, 'The German Air Force,' 527.

Lenin, V. I., 5-6, 8-9, 313, 449, 452.

Lees-Milne, James, 'The Age of Adam,' 413.

Leeson, Canon Spencer, 'The Public Schools Question,' 423-424.

Leo, XIII, 72-73, 74, 78.

Leroux, Alejandro, 34.

Leroy, 'Histoire des Idees Sociales en France,' 325, Note.

Leves, M., 397.

Lewis, Day, 339.

Lewis, John L., 538-539, 542-543.

Lindgren, G. S., 335.

Lindsay, Ian G., 'Georgian Edinburgh,' 424.

Lindsay, Sir Robert, 432, Note.

Lie, Trygvie, 22.

Lightfoot, Bishop, 289.

Litvinoff, Maxim, 452.

Lippmann, Walter, 404.

Livingstone, Sir Richard, 'Education for a World Adrift,' 369, 505.

Locke, John, 325-326.

Lloyd George, 1st Earl, 'The Truth about Peace Treaties,' 98, 429-430, 511.

Looker, Samuel, 'The Jefferies Companion,' 557.

Londonderry, 7th Marquess of, 443.

Longrigg, Brigadier, 497.

Lorrimer, James, 96.

Loveday, Arthur F., 'Spain versus Russia,' 21-36; 'Even Spain,' 310-324.

Ludwig, Emil, 'Bolivar,' 282-283.

Lushington, Vernon, 209.

Lytton Bulwer, 264.

M.

MacArthur, General, 405.

MacDonald, Dr Greville, 'Romance of a Specialist,' 212-214, 468.

MacDonald, Dr George, 212-214, 468.

MacDonald, Dr James, 85.

MacDonald, Sir John, 114.

MacDonald, Rt Hon. Ramsay, 430, 432, Note.

MacLennan, Hugh, 'Two Solitudes,' 113-114.

Macpherson, W. E., 'Soldiering in India,' 1764-1787, 105.

Maheux, Abbé, 124-125.

Maisky, M., 439.

Malan, Dr, 170, 176-177.

Malet, Sir Victor, 25.

Malinowski, Pro. Bronislaw, 'Freedom and Civilisation,' 274-275.

Manning, Cardinal, 468.

Mannheim, Dr Hermann, 491.

Marchand, Captain, 145, 150-152, 154, 156-160.

Marchant, Sir James, 'What Life has taught Me,' 422-423.

Marshall, General, 337-402.

Marshall, 'Sketch of the Vale of London and an Outline of its Rural Economy,' 381-382.

Martin, Speaker, 405.

Marx, Carl, 7, 327, 449.

Matthews, W. R., Dean of St Paul's, 440.

Maughan, Cuthbert, 'Replacing Lost Merchant Ships,' 340-352.

Maurer, Pro. D. W., 181.

Mayhew, Henry, 189.

Menarini, Dr, 190, Note.

Mermillod, Cardinal, 72.

Meyer, Edouard, 'Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums,' 285.

Mill, John Stuart, 'Liberty,' 328.

Millais, Sir John, 212, 250-254, 256-258, 464, 467.

Millmore, Royston, 'Brief Life of the Brontës,' 141-142.

Millward, Marguerite, 'Artist in Unknown India,' 555.

Mitchell, D. E., 175.

Mitford, Mary, 468.

Molteno, D., 170.

Molotov, V. W., 27.

Monson, Sir Edmund, 153, 156.

Montcalm, Marquis de, 159.

Montgomery, Field Marshal Viscount, 195, 444.

Montoro, Duchess of, 321.

Morgan, Charles, 330.

Morgan, J. P., 398.

Morris, William, 257.

Morrison, G. E., 243.

Morrison, Rt Hon. Herbert, 134.

Moorhouse, Sydney, 'Our Cities and Their Birds,' 44-55.

Mukerjee, Dr Shyama Prasad, 471.

Munich: The Disintegration of British Statesmanship, 425-444.

Munro, Sir Thomas, 111.

Mountbatten, Earl of Burma, 37, 42, 470.

Mullins, Claud, 'Should Criminal Courts pass Sentence?' 485-494.

Murray, Professor Gilbert, 'Greek Studies,' 339.

Murray, General James, 124.

Murray, Sir John, 'The Testing of "The Times",' 242-247.

Murray, Philip, 538, 544.
 Murphy, Hugh, 'Trade School for Aborigines,' 519.
 Mussolini, Benito, 433-434, 442.

N.

Narin, Jai Prakash, 478.
 Nathan, Lord, 335.
 Nagy, M. Francis, 390-393.
 Nasmyth, A., 456.
 Negrin, Dr, 32-33, 318.
 Nehru, Pandit, 39, 471, 473, 475, 477-478, 482.
 Newman, Cardinal, 257.
 Newton, Sir Charles, 237.
 Nichols, Beverley, 432.
 Nicholas I, Tsar of Russia, 388.
 Nicolaevsky, Boris I., 'Forced Labour in Russia,' 418-419.
 Nock, O. S., 'The Railways of Britain,' 553.
 Norman, Montague, 430. (Lord Norman.)
 Northcliffe, Viscount, 242, 245-246.

O.

Olivier, Lord, 'Jamaica: The Blessed Island,' 104-105.
 Ordjonikidze, Sergo, 8.
 Our Cities and Their Birds, 44-55.

P.

Page, Sir Leo, 'Psychiatry in the Criminal Courts,' 353-365; 'The Sentence of the Court,' 416, 488-489, 491.
 Pandit, Mrs, 173-174.
 Pannikar, Sardar K. M., 39.
 Papacy and International Problems, The, 70-82.
 Parkman, Francis, 122.
 Parnell, Charles Stewart, 243.
 Partridge, Eric, 'The Language of the Underworld,' 178-191; 'Usage and Abuse,' 510; 'Words at War: Words at Peace,' 556-557.
 Patel, Sardar, 471, 473, 475, 478, 483.
 Paterson, Sir Alexander, 360.
 Patiala, Maharaja of, 479.
 Paton, Sir Noel, 256.
 Pearson, Arthur, 245.
 Peman, Professor don Jose Maria, 324.
 Perkins, Miss Frances, 537.
 Peron, President, 35, 318.
 Peron, Señora, 35.
 Peers, Professor Allison, 324.
 Petrie, Sir Flinders, 'The Revolutions of Civilisation,' 329.
 Pilcher, Donald, 'The Regency Style,' 414.
 Pius VII, Pope, 70-71.
 Pius IX, Pope, 71.
 Pius X, Pope, 74-75.
 Pius XI, Pope, 76-79, 81.
 Pius XII, Pope, 77-79, 81, 82.
 Phillips, Tracey, 159, Note.
 Phipps, Sir Eric, 437.
 Poincaré, M., 445-446, 451.
 Pollock, Sir John, 'Communism in Practice,' 1-20, 445.
 Poynter, J. W., 'Papacy and International Problems,' 70-82.

Prasad, Sir Jagdish, 480.
 Presidential Elections: U.S.A., 398-411.
 Pre-Raphaelites as Religious Painters, 248-261.
 Prestige, Dr, 'The Life of Charles Gore,' 297, Note.
 Prieto, Indalecio, Sr, 32-33, 319-320.
 Problem of French Canada, The, 113-125.
 Prout, Samuel, 456.
 Psychiatry in the Criminal Courts, 353-365.

R.

Rahman el Mahdi, Sayed Sir Abdul, 148.
 Rakosi, M., 393.
 Rashdall, Dr, 297.
 Rask, Dr, 219-220.
 Ratray, Dr R. F., 'Ease and Group Selfishness,' 126-134.
 Rawlinson, H. G., 'The British Achievement in India,' 551-552.
 Ray, Gordon, 262-263, 268.
 Razvi, Saiyyed Qasim, 474.
 Reade, Charles, 131.
 Reckitt, Maurice B., 'Maurice to Temple,' 276-277.
 Rees, Dr J. R., 354.
 Reith, Lord, 62.
 Religion and Politics, 366-373.
 Rembrandt, 260.
 Repington, Charles à Court, 243.
 Replacing Lost American Ships, 340-352.
 Reuther, Walter, 539.
 Reynolds, E. E., 'The Scout Movement,' 503-511.
 Reynolds, Sir Joshua, 250.
 Ribbentrop, Herr von, 433, 436, 438.
 Rhodes, Cecil, 244.
 Riel, Louis, 114.
 Ritchie, Professor A. D., 'Essays in Philosophy,' 551.
 Ritchie, Lady Richmond, 262.
 Roberts, David, 468.
 Robles, Sr Gil, 319.
 Rodgers, John, 'English Rivers,' 557-558.
 Rogers, Will, 386.
 Rossetti, Dante Gabriel, 250-252, 254-255, 257.
 Rossetti, William Michael, 251.
 Rose, Pro. Holland, 'The Development of the European Nations,' 159-160.
 Rosebery, 5th Earl of, 155.
 Rostovtzeff, Pro., 303.
 Roosevelt, President, F. D., 227, 330, 400, 402, 405, 410, 535, 537-538, 540-541, 542, 544.
 Roy, Miss Gabrielle, 'The Tin Flute,' 113, 123-124.
 Runciman, Rt Hon. Walter, afterwards 1st Viscount, 440-441, 442.
 Rundell, General Sir Leslie, 149.
 Ruskin, John, 204-218, 257, 455-457, 458-468, 506-508.
 Ruskin, John James, 458, 460, 462, 464-467.
 Ruskin, Margaret, 456, 458, 464-467.
 Ruskin and Rosie La Touche, 204-218.

S.

Salisbury, 3rd Marquess of, 145, 147-151, 153-160, 429, 434, 438.
 Sandford, Brigadier, 502.

Sarrut, M., 437.
 Sastri, Hon. V. S., 168.
 Sassoon, Siegfried, 338 and Note.
 Saunders, George, 243.
 Scott, C. P., 528.
 Schacht, Dr, 430.
 Scott, Rev. Laurence, 323.
 Scott, Sir Walter, 264.
 Scott, Dr Walter S., 'Ruakin and Rosie la Touche,' 204-218; 'John Ruakin's Parents,' 455-468.
 Scott-Moncrieff, George, 'Edinburgh,' 138-139.
 Scout Movement, The, 503-511.
 Seccombe, Lionel, 191.
 Seddon, Thomas, 256.
 Selden-Goth, Mr, 'Mendelssohn,' 142-143.
 Seton-Watson, Professor, 146.
 Severn, Arthur, 213.
 Shakespeare, William, 291.
 Shaw, George Bernard, 227, 306, 328, 432.
 Shaw, Flora (afterwards Lady Lugard), 243.
 Shaplen, Joseph, 526.
 Sheppard, Major E. W., 'Short History of the British Army,' 109.
 Sheppard, H. R. L., Dean of Canterbury, 432.
 Should Criminal Courts pass Sentence? 485-494.
 Sidgwick, Henry, 297, Note.
 Sinclair, Sir Archibald, 527.
 Singh, The Sadhu Sundar, 204.
 Simon, Sir John, afterwards Viscount, 430-431, 432.
 Sitwell, Sir Osbert, 267.
 Sitwell, Sacheverell, 'The Netherlands,' 553-554.
 Skinner, Thomas, 'Excursions in India,' 105.
 Sleeman, Major-General, 'Rambles and Recollections of an Indian Official,' 105-107.
 Smith, Andrew, 13, 18-19.
 Smith, David, 'The Same Sky over All,' 559.
 Smith, Professor Goldwin, 'Canada and the Canadian Institution,' 113.
 Smith, Robert, 46.
 Smith, Sir William, 503.
 Smuts, Field-Marshal, 165-166, 171-174, 176-177.
 Snowden, Philip, afterwards Viscount, 430.
 Some Past and Present Experiences of the Middle Class, 298-309.
 Some Recent Books, 135-144, 273-284, 412-424, 547-559.
 Sorel, Georges, 449.
 Sorin, Professor, 6-7.
 Soulbury, Lord, 'Some Past and Present Experiences of the Middle Class,' 298-309.
 South African Indians, The, and UNO,' 162-177.
 Spaight, J. M., 'The Birth of Unoforce,' 93-99; 'American and Russian Air Power,' 523-530.
 Spain versus Russia, 21-36.
 Sparkman, Senator, 401.
 Stafford, Colonel, 496.
 Stalin, Generalissimo, 4, 6, 14, 19, 313-314, 315.
 Stamp, Lord, 308.
 Stanier, Sir William, 236.
 Stassen, Harold, 405-406, 408-410.
 Steed, H. Wickham, 243.
 Stepniak, Fanny, 5.

Stephens, F. G., 252.
 Stephenson, George, 241, Note.
 Stevenson, John A., 'The Problem of French Canada,' 113-125, 411; 'The American Labour Front,' 531-546.
 Stewart, Cecil, 'Byzantine Legacy,' 140-141.
 Strachey, John, Rt Hon., 134.
 Strachey, Lytton, 432.
 Streeter, Canon, 294, 297.
 Stresemann, Dr, 436.
 Stirling, Patrick, 223-230.
 Swinton, Major-General Sir E. D., 2.
 Symington, Stuart, 524.

T.

Taft, Senator, 405-406, 408-409.
 Tansley, Professor A. G., 374.
 Tardieu, André, 'Anatomy of Communism,' 445-454, 446, 447-448 and Note, 453, Note.
 Temple, Lord Mount, 468.
 Templewood, Lord, and Note, 'Ambassador on Special Mission,' 314. See Hoare, Sir S.
 Testing of 'The Times,' The, 242-247.
 Tennyson, Lord, 262.
 Thackeray, 262-272.
 Thackeray, W. M., 262-266, 268-272.
 'The English Language: Its Beauty and its Use,' 548-549.
 The Linguistic Field—Forever Babel? 219-227.
 They also Served, 100-112.
 Thirlwall, Bishop, 289.
 Thomas, Rt Hon. J. H., 167.
 Thomas, Norman, 411, 545.
 Thompson, R. W., 'Devil at my Heels,' 277-278.
 Thomson, J. A. K., 'The Classical Background of English Literature,' 420-421.
 Thursfield, Sir James Richard, 243.
 Tito, Marshal, 395.
 Trollope, Anthony, 266-267, 270-272.
 Triebel, Professor L. A., 'The Linguistic Field—Forever Babel?' 219-227.
 Trevelyan, Professor, G. M., 'English Social History,' 367.
 Trevor, Roper, 'The Last Days of Hitler,' 510.
 Trotsky, L., 4-7, 12.
 Truman, President, 81, 310, 401-403, 405, 408, 410-411.
 Tsaihai, Princess, 501.
 Tuhachevsky, General, 10.
 Turner, J. M. W., 456.

V.

Van Den Bark, Melvin, 'The American Thesaurus of Slang,' 181.
 Vandenberg, Senator, 405, 407, 409-410.
 Vane, Michael, 'The South African Indians and UNO,' 162-177.
 Vannutelli, Cardinal Vincenzo, 75.
 Vansittart, Sir Robert, 431, 438.
 Vaux, James Hardy, 188.
 Veblen, Thorstein, 'The Nature of Peace and the Means of its Perpetuation,' 531.
 Victoria, Queen, 152, 243.
 Villiers, Marjorie, 'The Displaced Person: A Twentieth Century Phenomenon,' 83-92.
 Vinson, Chief Justice, 403.

Von Bülow, Prince, 443.
 Von Neurath, Freiherr, 437-438.

W.

Wade, Mason, 'French Canadian Outlook,' 113, 122-123, 125.
 Walter, Arthur, 242, 244-246.
 Walter, John, 246.
 Wallace, Donald Mackenzie, 243.
 Wallace, Henry, 399, 402, 410-411, 543-545.
 Ward, J. D. U., 'Concerning English Oak and Timber,' 374-387, and Note, 285.
 Warner, Oliver, 'Captains and Kings,' 143.
 Warren, Governor, 544.
 Watkin, Sir Edward, 229, 235.
 Watts, C. F., 256.
 Welsh, Col. James, 'Reminiscences,' 105, 109-111, 113.
 Wells, H. G., 131.
 Wheeler-Bennett, J. W., 'Munich: Prologue to Tragedy,' 425, 438, 440-441, 442, 443, Note.
 Werth, Alexander, 'The Year of Stalingrad,' 527.
 Wesley, John, 257.
 Whiffen, Marcus, 'Stuart and Georgian Churches outside London,' 412-413.
 Widdowson, Dr, 65.
 Wilkie, Wendell, 251, 400, 407, 538.
 Wilson, Sir Horace, 442.
 Wilson, President Woodrow, 400, 534.

Wilson, W. B., 534.
 William II, German Emperor, 247.
 Williams-Ellis, Mrs, 'The Tragedy of John Ruskin,' 217.
 Willcocks, M. P., A 'True Born Englishman,' 280-281.
 Winchester, Dean of, 'The Credibility of the Gospel,' 285-297.
 Wingate, General Orde, 500, 502.
 Womersley, Sir Walter, 443, Note.
 Wordsworth, William, 263.
 Woolner, Thomas, 252.
 Worsley, Dr J. W. B., 'British Railways Past and Present,' 228-241.
 Wright, Joseph, 'English Dialect Dictionary,' 222.

Y.

Yates, Edmund, 265.
 Young, Miss, 'Letters of a Noble Woman,' 213, 217.
 Younghusband, Sir Francis, 339.
 'Year Book, London Institute of World Affairs,' 279-280.
 Year of Independence in India and Pakistan, 460-484.

Z.

Zamorra, Sr Alcala, 313.

END OF THE TWO HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-SIXTH VOLUME

World News by Magazine

This has been our business for over eighty years and we feel competent to give you the service which you desire.

We are the largest and most reliable agency for prompt delivery of Foreign and Domestic Periodicals in this Country.

We carry the latest English, Irish and German Publications in stock.

LIBRARIES:—ORDERS FOR ENGLISH BOOKS receive prompt attention to insure fast service through our **LIBRARY ORDER DEPARTMENT**, which has been opened to fill your special needs.

Our subscription prices include postage to all parts of the United States, Cuba, Mexico, Porto Rico.

Our **BACK NUMBER DEPT.** can furnish quick service in supplying you with old issues.

For quick and efficient service send your orders for Foreign Publications to

THE INTERNATIONAL NEWS COMPANY

Division of **THE AMERICAN NEWS COMPANY, INC.**

131 Varick Street, New York City

Send for Price Lists

THE HISTORY OF THE CITY OF BOSTON

FROM THE FIRST SETTLEMENT
TO THE PRESENT TIME

BY
JOSEPH NEALE

VOLUME I
FROM THE FIRST SETTLEMENT
TO THE YEAR 1630

BOSTON:
PUBLISHED BY
J. NEALE

1850

THE HISTORY OF THE
CITY OF BOSTON

FROM THE FIRST SETTLEMENT
TO THE PRESENT TIME

BY
JOSEPH NEALE

VOLUME I
FROM THE FIRST SETTLEMENT
TO THE YEAR 1630

BOSTON:
PUBLISHED BY
J. NEALE

